Pedo-Baptiſm diſproved;

BEING AN

ANSWER

To two printed Papers (put forth by ſome Gentlemen

CALLED THE

Athenian Society,

Who pretend to anſwer all Queſtions ſent to them of what Nature ſoever)

CALLED THE

Athenian Mercury,

One put forth *November* 14. the other *November*. 28, 1691. In which Papers they pretend to anſwer eight Queries about the Lawfulneſs of

INFANT-BAPTISM.

Likewiſe divers QUERIES ſent to them about the *true Subjects of Baptiſm*, &c.

The Second Edition, to which is added twenty Sylogiſtical Arguments to diſprove Infant-Baptiſm.

London, Printed for the Author, and ſold by *John Harris* at the Sign of the Harrow in the *Poultry*. MDCXCI.

Price four Pence.

AN ANSWER TO THE *ATHENIAN MERCURY*, VOL. 4. NUMB. 14. CONCERNING INFANT-BAPTISM.

With an Account of divers Queſtions ſent by the Author (and ſome others) to the *Athenian Society*, which they have not yet anſwered.

Gentlemen,

WHO he was that ſent you the firſt Queſtions about Infant-Baptiſm, I know not; whether he was an Antipedo-Baptiſt, or a Pedo-Baptiſt, is a Queſtion: but your calling upon all who had any Doubts about it, to ſend in their Objections, argues a great degree of Confidence of your Ability, of doing more than all before: For 'tis ſtrange you ſhould attempt to call for all our Objections, when it appears you intended to write but one half Sheet of Paper in Anſwer to them; as if you could do that in a few Lines, which others, as learned as your ſelves, could never yet do in great Volumes; this favours (as ſome judg) of great Pride, and caſts much Contempt upon you, and leſſens your Reputation among wiſe Men who are for Pedo-Baptiſm, as well as others. And yet after all the great and mighty noiſe, you have not ſo much as in the leaſt touched the chief Queſtions, which, to my knowledg, were ſent you near a Fortnight before your ſaid *Mercury* came forth. And therefore to ſhew how diſingenuous you have been herein, I thought it might not be amiſs to ſpend a few ſpare hours upon your *Mercury*.

1. The firſt Queſtion you pretend to anſwer is this, *i. e. Whether Baptiſm (as it is commonly*

commonly taught) *is the proper and natural Antitype of Circumcision?*

Reply. As to what you speak of the Customs of Nations, Linguisms, and of Men being ignorant of Radixes, or Original Significations in Langages, seems remote to the business, and serves for little else than to blot Paper, or rather to darken Counsel: Certainly the Ordinance of Baptism, one of the two great Sacraments of the New-Testament, doth not lie so obscure in God's Word, either what it is, or who are the proper Subjects thereof, that Men must be at a loss about it, unless they understand the Radixes, or original Significations of Languages. But to proceed, you would, it seems, have Baptism to be the proper Antitype of Circumcision in some respect, and not in others.

First, From the Customs of the Jews in proselyting the Gentiles into their Religion: so far you say indeed Circumcision was not a Type, but a continuance of a Custom. Now how absurd and ridiculous that is which you affirm upon this account, may appear to all. Will you assert and stand by it, that Baptism was a Jewish Custom, and so no pure Gospel-Institution? Doubtless, if so, the Pharisees might have soon given our Saviour a ready Answer to his great Question, *viz. The Baptism of* John, *whether is it from Heaven, or of Men?* Mat. 21. 25. Certainly there was no Baptism of this nature of Divine Institution, before *John* received it from Heaven. But, say you, *If* John *Baptist undertook any new way of proselyting the Jews into the Gospel, they had not only struggled with the Opposition of his new Doctrine, but also of his new Practice; therefore* (say you) *it was that this Custom was continued, and had the Super-addition of the full force of Baptism, viz. a Consignation or Seal of the Covenant.*

Reply. As you confess his Doctrine was new, so was his Baptism no doubt; for, as our Annotators observe, his Baptism was part of his Doctrine. Pray, what was the Doctrine he preach'd? was it not Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins? Mark 1. 4. Moreover, we do not read they were more displeased with his new Doctrine, than with his new Practice.

2. But what Authority have you to affirm, Gospel-Baptism was but the continuance of a Jewish Custom, or was a Legal Rite, or rather indeed a human Tradition? for 'tis evident the Jews were not required, or commanded of God to baptize their Proselytes, or others; for Circumcision was the only Rite by which Proselytes (who were Males) were added to the Jewish Church, as we find God commanded *Abraham*. And if Baptism had been so frequently practised amongst the Jews, as you assert, wherefore did the Pharisees say to *John*, *Why dost thou baptize, if thou art not that Christ, nor* Elias? *John* 1. 25. Moreover, Baptism is directly called a Principle of the Doctrine of Christ, *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. which Doctrine our Saviour saith he received from his Father. If it be a Principle of the Doctrine of Christ, it follows undeniably, he instituted it, and gave it forth. Furthermore, if Baptism was practised all along among the Jews, I argue, Either they practised it as a Mosaical Rite, or else as a Tradition of their own: not, say I, as a Mosaical Rite, because *Moses* never commanded them so to do; for he speaks nothing of it, and yet declared all things God commanded him; and did every thing according to the Pattern shewed him in the Mount. And if it was a human Jewish Tradition, what is become of one of the great Sacraments of the New Testament? Must it be look'd upon from henceforth to be nothing else than the continuance of a Jewish Tradition taken out of their fabulous and erronious *Talmud?* What kind of poisonous Stuff is this you trouble the World with? What tho the Jews, who had made the Commandments of God void through their Traditions, did practise some such thing; Must you affirm Gospel-Baptism in its Rise and Original sprung from their Custom? And because they baptized Proselytes both Men, Women and Children, must Christians do so too? Sure the Custom of the Romish Church in baptizing of Infants, as a human Tradition, is every way of as good

Authority

Authority to warrant us ſo to do, as the Cuſtom of the unbelieving Jews. But pray take what a Learned Pedo-Baptiſt, and a Son of the Church of *England*, hath ſaid in anſwer to this vain Conceit; 'tis Sir *Norton Knatchbull*, in his *Animadverſiones in lib. Novi Teſtamenti*, pag. 313. '*As cum videam ſummi ju-*'*dicii viros in his temporibus ex Rabbinis funda-*'*menta petere veritatis*, &c. But when I ſee in 'theſe times ſome Men of the greateſt Judg-'ment to fetch the Foundation of Truth 'from the Rabbins, I cannot but ſtick at it: 'for whence was the *Talmud* ſent to us, (they 'are the words (ſaith he) of *Buxtorf* in his '*Synagoga Judaica*) that we ſhould give ſo 'much Credit thereto, that we ſhould be-'lieve that the Moſaick Law either was or 'ought to be underſtood therefrom, much 'leſs the Goſpel, to which they are profeſſed 'Enemies? The *Talmud* is called a Laby-'rinth of Errors, and the foundation of 'Jewiſh Fables; it was perfected and acknow-'ledged for Authentick five hundred Years 'after Chriſt, and out of it *Maimonides* drew 'his Doctrine, as all the reſt of them; there-'fore we cannot acquieſce in ſuch Teſtimo-'ny——*Gentlemen*, either anſwer no more Queſtions about Religion, or take more heed to what you ſay: for your pleading for Infant-Baptiſm, from ſuch grounds, all may perceive tends to caſt an Odium and Contempt on the Chriſtian Religion. Therefore I infer, your Proof for this Practice from the Cuſtom amongſt the Jews about baptizing of Proſelytes both Men, Women and Children, proves nothing; you were better, for the Authority of it, to urge the Decrees of Popes and General Councils; a Popiſh Innovation is as good as a Jewiſh one.

But however, you do allow that our bleſſed Saviour did add ſomething to this pretended Jewiſh Cuſtom, and hath not only put it *in full force, but alſo made it a Confignation or Seal of the Covenant; and this, ſay you, is further ſtrengthened by ſeveral undeniable Texts of Scripture, which Anabaptiſts themſelves can never get clear of; and ask them, they muſt either be ſilent, or give ſuch a Paraphraſe as we do.* The Texts are theſe: Firſt, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. *In whom alſo ye are circumciſed with the Circumciſion made without hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh, by the Circumciſion of Chriſt. Buried with him in Baptiſm*, &c. The ſecond, that of baptizing the *Iſraelites* in the Red-Sea, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. The laſt is the ſaving of *Noah* and his Family in the Ark, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.

Reply 1. But is it ſo indeed? did our Saviour in inſtituting Goſpel-Baptiſm do no more than put a Jewiſh Cuſtom to be in full force, and make it a Conſignation or Seal of the Covenant? Were you not learned and ingenious Men, I ſhould not ſo much admire at your Notions.

2. But the Truth is, in the ſecond place, if you had not told us in your next words, to what purpoſe you mention thoſe Scriptures, we ſhould have been at a great loſs about it, or not well have underſtood your Intention; but you, like the ingenious Painter, ſoon inform us, and tell us what 'tis—— *i. e.* you tell us, you urge not theſe things to prove any thing elſe, but the Parallel betwixt Circumciſion and Baptiſm, or to ſpeak (ſay you) more properly, the neceſſary continuance of the old Manner amongſt the Jews of continuing their way of proſelyting the Heathen.

3. Was it neceſſary then, that a human Tradition of the Jews ſhould be continued? I am ſure the Apoſtle tells you that Chriſt nailed all the Jewiſh Ceremonies of the Moſaical Law to the Croſs, and that they all ceaſed when the Antitype was come; and beſure had the Baptiſm you ſpeak of been indeed a Moſaical Rite, I mean appointed or commanded of God, it had vaniſhed with its Fellows: But 'tis hard Chriſt ſhould aboliſh all Legal Cuſtoms, or Ceremonial Ordinances, and yet confirm, with ſome addition, a Cuſtom of the Jews own inventing.

4. You do not ſeem to diſtinguiſh between your twofold Anſwer to the Queſtion; I thought you had brought thoſe Scriptures to prove Baptiſm the proper Antitype of Circumciſion; but you urge the former old

Cuſtom

Cuſtom again, ſo that here's no Scripture nor Argument brought by you to prove the thing in hand. As touching what you ſay of the Parallel betwixt Circumciſion and Baptiſm ſignifies nothing; if in ſome things there ſhould be a Parallel, it doth not follow therefore Baptiſm was the Antitype of Circumciſion. What tho Circumciſion was the initiating Ordinance of the Male Children into the Jewiſh Church, and Baptiſm is that initiating Ordinance into the Goſpel-Church; this doth not prove the one the Type of the other.

5. But pray, what is it that the Anabaptiſts can never get clear of, or being ask'd the Expoſition, they muſt be ſilent, or give ſuch a Paraphraſe as you do? I muſt tell you, I know no Text more full for our practice of baptizing Believers, than that in *Col.* 2. 11, 12. We ſay from thence, that the proper Antitype of Circumciſion in the Fleſh, is the Circumciſion of the Heart, and therefore not Baptiſm; tho 'tis granted by us, that in Baptiſm there is a Repreſentation of the new Birth, and Mortification of Sin, which Circumciſion was the expreſs Type of: And this cannot weaken nor ſilence us, but rather ſtrengthen our hands. All that can well be inferred from this Text, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. where the Apoſtle mentions Circumciſion and Baptiſm, is no more than this, *viz.* Where Baptiſm is adminiſtred upon a proper Subject, it repreſents the Spiritual and Myſtical Circumciſion of the Heart, *i. e.* that the Soul is dead to Sin, or that he hath *put off the Body of Sins of the Fleſh by the Circumciſion of Chriſt*; which may refer to the Power of his Death in the Effects thereof, by the effectual Sin-killing Operations of the holy Spirit on the Heart: And as we being dead to Sin, we are alſo buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, both in the Sign, *i. e.* covered all over in the Water, which reſembles in a lively Figure his Burial, and alſo in Signification, *i. e.* the Power and bleſſed Effects of his Death, having been the Death of the old Man, or that Body of Sin in us, wherein alſo in like manner we are alſo riſen with him through the Faith of the Operation of God; and this is likewiſe held forth both in Sign and Signification in true Baptiſm.

Now if this be not your Paraphraſe on this Text, we cannot help it. I know many Learned Men who own Pedo-Baptiſm, ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe; nor is there any reaſon for you to ſay we muſt be ſilent, *&c.* as if we knew not what to ſay to this Text: But what is this for Infant-Baptiſm, or to prove Baptiſm the Antitype of Circumciſion? Doth Sprinkling repreſent a Burial? doth the Sign or Figure of Chriſt's Burial appear in ſprinkling a little Water on the Face, and as it is done to an Infant, in whom Faith and Regeneration is not wrought? what doth there appear in Signification? Doth not the Church of *England* ſay, that *Baptiſm is the outward Sign of an inward Spiritual Grace*? ſure that is but a mock-Baptiſm, where there is neither the Sign or Figure of Chriſt's Death and Burial, *&c.* nor that inward Work wrought upon the Perſon baptized, which is ſignified, or ought to be ſignified thereby, *viz.* That the ſaid Perſon is dead to Sin, and raiſed up by the Faith of the Operation of God to walk in newneſs of Life.

But alas, this it ſeems is not the thing; 'tis not ſo much to prove Baptiſm to be the Antitype of Circumciſion, as 'tis to prove Baptiſm to be the continuation of a Jewiſh Cuſtom: *for to ſpeak more properly*, you intimate, that to this purpoſe, you mention theſe things. Sure all underſtanding Men, as well Pedo-Baptiſts as others, muſt needs loath your Notion; but I know you are not alone herein, there are ſome others who have aſſerted the ſame thing; which perhaps incouraged you thus to write: But to correct your Raſhneſs, and ſilence you and them too, conſider what I and the fore-mentioned Gentleman have ſaid. Is it not enough that Infant-Baptiſm ſhould be built upon no better a Foundation than the Tradition of the Apoſtate Gentile Church, and the Decrees of Popes and General Councils, but that it muſt alſo be grounded on the erroneous Cuſtoms of the Jewiſh *Talmud*? But to proceed, that

Circum-

Circumcision may answer, or run Parallel with Baptism, you bring in the Practice of some Heathen Nations who circumcised their Females. We shall have it anon; The truth is, the Proof and Explanation of Infant-Baptism shall be sufficiently made out before you have done; if fabulous and erroneous Traditions of Jews, Heathens, and Apostate Christians will do it: but if no better Authority or Proof can be brought for it than what is contained in your *Mercury*, 'tis time for all good Christians with Shame enough to cast it off. Should I tell my Reader why some Heathens circumcised their Females, it might greatly expose you. But to close with your first Question, take what Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, late Bishop of *Down*, hath said upon this Conceit, *i. e.* that Circumcision figured Baptism; these are his words, *viz.* 'The Argument, saith he, from Circumcision 'is invalid upon infinite Considerations: Fi'gures and Types prove nothing, unless a 'Command go along with them, or some 'Express to signify such to be their purpose: 'for the Deluge of Waters, and the Ark of 'Noah, were Figures of Baptism, saith *Peter*. 'If therefore the Circumstances of the one 'should be drawn to the other, we should 'make Baptism a Prodigy rather than a 'Rite. The Paschal Lamb was a Figure of 'the Eucharist, which succeeds the other, as 'Baptism doth to Circumcision: but because 'there was in the Manducation of the Pas'chal Lamb no Prescription of Sacramental 'Drink, shall we thence conclude that the 'Eucharist is to be administred in one kind? 'And even in the very instance of this Ar'gument, suppose a Correspondency of the 'Analogy between Circumcision and Bap'tism, yet there is no Correspondency of Iden'tity; for tho it be granted, that both of 'them did consign the Covenant of Faith, 'yet there is nothing in the Circumstances 'of Children being circumcised that so 'concerns that Mystery, but that it might 'very well be given to Men of Reason; be'cause Circumcision left a Character in the 'Flesh, which being imprinted upon the In'fant, did its work to them when they came 'to Age; and such a Character was necessary, 'because there was no word added to the 'Sign; but Baptism imprints nothing that 'remains on the Body; and if it leaves a 'Character at all, it is upon the Soul to 'which the Word is added, which is as 'much a part of the Sacrament as the Sign 'it self: for both which Reasons it is requi'site that the Party baptized should be ca'pable of Reason, that they may be capa'ble both of the Word and of the Sacra'ment, and the Impress upon the Spirit: 'Since therefore the Reason of the Parity 'does wholly fail, there is nothing left to in'fer a necessity of complying in the Circum'stance of Age, any more than in the o'ther Annexes of Types: Then the Infant 'must also precisely be baptized upon the 'eighth day, and Females must not be bap'tized at all, because not circumcised; but 'it were more proper, if we would under'stand it aright, to prosecute the Analogy 'from the Type to the Antitype, by the way 'for Letter and Spirit, and Signification; and 'as Circumcision figures Baptism, so also the 'Adjuncts of the Circumcised shall signify 'some thing spiritual in the Adherence of 'Baptism; and therefore as Infants were 'circumcised, so spiritual Infants should be 'baptized, which is spiritual Circumcision; 'for therefore Babes had the Ministry of the 'Type, to signify that we must, when we give 'our Names to Christ, become Children in 'Malice, and then the Type is made com'plear. Thus the worthy Doctor hath answered your Question, and you too. If Circumcision must be a Type of Baptism, he hath shewed how, and how not, if it be so taken; but the truth is, all Types cease when the Antitype is come, the one must give way to the other; but Circumcision did continue in full force some Years after Baptism was in full force; for Circumcision ended not till Christ nailed it to his Cross; therefore it could not be the Type of Baptism: and how a Shadow or Sign should be the proper Antitype of a Shadow I see not.

Bu-

But enough hath been ſaid to this, and I ſhould not have ſaid ſo much to it, but becauſe your Notion ſeems new to ſome.

As touching the other two Scriptures you mention, *viz.* that in 1 *Cor.* 10. 'tis very impertinently cited for your buſineſs, to prove Circumciſion the Type of Goſpel-Baptiſm; for this Text ſpeaks nothing of that in the leaſt, nor no more doth that in *Peter*. Suppoſe the Red-ſea was a Figure of Baptiſm, and ſo alſo the Water and Ark of *Noah*; what of all this, if you had urged the Fathers and Children were baptized to *Moſes* in the Sea and in the Cloud, and therefore Children may be Baptized? I would have anſwered you that was but a figurative Baptiſm, and proves nothing; beſides, it would prove Unbelievers may be baptized alſo, becauſe there was a mixt Multitude as well ſo baptized, as were the Fathers and their Children; beſides, much Cattel were with them in the Sea, and under the Cloud.

Queſt. 2. *What certain indubitable Grounds can we have for the Practice of Infant-Baptiſm.*

You anſwer, The certain Ground is from the Scripture, and firſt from the Words of the Commiſſion, *Matth.* 28. μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *diſciple all Nations*; and then follows, *Baptizing them in the name*, &c.

From the order of which words (you ſay) Infants are not excluded from Baptiſm, as is generally believed by Anabaptiſts; a Perſon may be Baptized before he is taught; for ſay you μαθητεύσατε, *Mathetuſate*, ſignifies, to diſciple all Nations perſonally and ſubjectively; being a general word, it contains the other two that follow, *viz.* Baptizing and Teaching, it being a word of the Imperative Mood, and the other two only Participles; ſo that the Commiſſion of it is *that*, and the Mood of it *theſe*: but in the Mood, Baptizing them precedes Teaching them to obſerve all things, *&c.*

Reply. Becauſe there is a Teaching follows Baptiſm, doth it therefore follow, according to the Order of the ſacred Commiſſion, there is no Teaching indiſpenſibly to go before the Perſon is baptized? You have cauſe to tremble for trifling and baſely inverting the order of the Commiſſion of our Bleſſed Saviour; what though the Greek word *Diſciple*, or make Diſciples, be a word of the Imperative Mood; O ſtrange! have you found it out? will this do your buſineſs? doth it therefore contain the other two? I ask you, whether a Man may not be made a Diſciple, and not be Baptized, or, be Baptized, and yet not be diſcipled? *Matth.* 13. 52. 'tis μαθητευθεὶς, in *Matth.* 28. 'tis *diſciple ye*; here 'tis *diſcipled*, inſtructed, or that is taught, and 'tis from the ſame Verb with the other: 'Tis evident notwithſtanding all your Flouriſh, that Teaching, according to the Order of the Commiſſion, goes, and muſt go before Baptizing, though the Perſon baptized is to be taught afterwards; alſo, all things that Chriſt commanded his Diſciples, both as to Doctrine and Practice, that ſo they may be faithful Followers of Chriſt unto the end. This Teaching after Baptiſm indeed the Baptiſts cannot deny, unleſs they ſhould be ſo fooliſh as to ſay, a Baptized Believer needs no further teaching, *&c.* but you know in your Conſciences, we deny, and that too by the Authority of the Commiſſion, that any ought to be Baptized but ſuch who are made Diſciples by their firſt being taught. Doth Baptiſm, Sirs, make either Children or others Diſciples? if you do not aſſert that, what do you ſay: and if all Nations, or any in the Nations, are to be Baptized before they are taught or made Diſciples, why may not a Miniſter, by the Authority of the Commiſſion, baptize Turks, Pagans and Infidels, with their Children, as well as the Infants of Chriſtian People?

Moreover; if ſo be Baptizing may go before Teaching, or Perſons being made Diſciples, why did *Philip* anſwer the *Eunuch* after that manner, when he asked him why he might not be Baptized? the Anſwer is, *If thou believeſt with all thy Heart, thou mayeſt*; inti-

intimating, unleſs he ſo believed, he might not. Alſo why did Chriſt make Diſciples firſt, and then baptize them? *Joh.* 4. 1. I muſt alſo tell you, that your Expoſition of the Commiſſion in *Matthew*, doth tend to invert the Order of the ſame Commiſſion in *Mark* 16. 15, 16. where our Saviour commands his Diſciples to go and preach the Goſpel to every Creature, and then ſaith, *He that believeth and is Baptized, ſhall be ſaved*: this not he that is baptized and then believeth. But to give divers godly and learned *Pedo-Baptiſts* their due, they I find dare not attempt to invert the Order of the Holy Commiſſion, as you ſeem to do, though it ſhakes the Foundation of their own Practice: See Reverend Mr. *Perkins* on theſe Words, *Teach all Nations, baptizing them*; ſaith he, I explain the former thus; 'Firſt of all, it is 'ſaid, Teach them, that is, make them my 'Diſciples, by teaching them to believe and 'repent. Here we are to conſider the Order 'which God obſerves in making with Men a 'Covenant in Baptiſm; firſt of all he calls 'them by his Word and Spirit to believe and 'repent. Then in the ſecond Place, he makes 'a Promiſe of Mercy and Forgiveneſs. And 'then thirdly, he ſeals his Promiſe by Bap'tiſm. They, ſays he, that know not, nor 'conſider this Order which God uſed in co'venanting with them in Baptiſm, deal pre'poſterouſly, over-ſlipping the Command'ment of repenting and believing, and is the 'cauſe of ſo much Prophaneneſs in the 'World. Much to the ſame Purpoſe ſaith Mr. *Baxter*, *Right to Baptiſm*, p. 149, 150. ſpeaking of the Order of this Commiſſion Chriſt gave to his Diſciples; Their firſt Task '(ſays he) is to make Diſciples, which are 'by *Mark* called Believers.

'The ſecond Work is to baptize them, 'whereto is annexed the Promiſe of Salva'tion.

'The third Work is to teach them all o'ther things which are after to be learned in 'the School of Chriſt. To contemn this Order, 'ſaith he, is to contemn the Rules of Order, 'for where can we find it if not here? I pro'feſs my Conſcience is fully ſatisfied from 'this Text, that there is one ſort of Faith 'ſaving ——— that muſt go before Bap'tiſm, the Profeſſion whereof the Miniſter 'muſt expect.

Your ſecond Scripture-Ground is that of *whole Families being baptized*.

Reply; You cannot be ignorant that this Proof hath been often invalidated: How many Families are there in this City, in which there is not one Infant? Beſides, 'tis ſaid, *Paul* preached the Word to the Jailor, and to all in his Houſe: alſo 'tis expreſly ſaid, *He believed in God with all his Houſe*. We have as much Ground to believe that in theſe Families there were ſome Servants or Children who were Unbelievers, as to believe there were little Babes; and becauſe whole Houſholds are ſaid to be baptized, therefore unbelieving Servants, Sons and Daughters, as well as little Children. Others may infer ungodly Servants and unbelieving Children, that were grown up to be Men and Women, were baptized alſo in thoſe Families. In Jailors Families now a-days 'tis evident there are too many wicked and ungodly ones; and this Jailor was none of the beſt before converted, 'tis plain. Beſides, *whole* or *all*, doth not comprehend always every individual Perſon, as 1 *Sam.* 21. 28. Moreover, Dr. *Hammond* ſaith, 'That to conclude, Infants were 'baptized, becauſe Houſholds are mentioned 'ſo to be, is, ſaith he, unconvincing, and 'without Demonſtration, it being ſo uncer'tain whether there were any Children in 'thoſe Families: His Letter *p.* 471. *Sect.* 21.

Your third Scripture-Ground is that of the Promiſe (you ſay Covenant) made to you and your Children.

Reply; How often have we ſhewed that this Text proves not that any Children, *quatenus* as ſuch, ſhould be baptized, nor, as ſuch, that they are in the Covenant of Grace, or have the Promiſe made to them; the Promiſe runs to the Jews and to their Offspring, and not to them only, but to Gentiles alſo, who were ſaid *to be afar off*: But pray obſerve,

ſerve, 'tis to no more of the Jews and their Children or Offspring, and ſuch who were afar off, than the Lord ſhall call or make Diſciples by the Word and effectual Operations of the Holy Spirit. My Sons and Daughters are as much my Children when they are twenty or thirty Years old, as well as when Babes. Dr. *Hammond* alſo grants, Children in this Text doth not refer to Infants as ſuch, but to the Poſterity of the Jews, *p.* 490. *Sect.* 81. *If ye be Chriſt's, then you are* Abraham's *Seed, and Heirs according to the Promiſe. The Children of the Fleſh*, ſaith *Paul*, *theſe are not the Children of God; but the Children of the Promiſe are accounted for the Seed*, Rom. 9. 8. Not if you be the Offspring of *Abraham* according to the Fleſh, or Seed of Believers.

Your fourth Scripture-Proof is, *that of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Reply. This proves no more Children ought to be baptized, than they ought to receive the Lord's Supper, Baptiſm being a mere poſitive Precept, and only depends upon the Will and ſovereign Pleaſure of the great Lawgiver Jeſus Chriſt. A thouſand ſuch Inſtances prove not they ought to be baptized, except there was a Precept annexed, or Precedent for it in God's Word. Beſides, *of ſuch*, &c. (as one well obſerves) may intend ſuch and ſuch that have like Qualities, *viz.* harmleſs, meek, *&c.* as Children? Therefore the Anabaptiſts (as you call them) are not uncharitable, who ſay, Infants have no more Right to Baptiſm than unreaſonable Creatures; for what can give them Right thereto, but the Authority of God's Word?

You ask what Privilege the Children of Believers have above Unbelievers? We anſwer, They have the advantage of their Parents Prayers, Inſtruction, godly Education, and good Example.

But, ſay you, *they are holy.*

Anſw. We deny it intends federal Holineſs, ſuch as qualifies Children for Baptiſm. We read in *Mal.* 2. 15. of Marriage, and that Children begotten in lawful Wedlock are called *a godly Seed*, in oppoſition to their being illegitimate. Now that it was about Marriages the Corinthians wrote to *S. Paul*, is evident, they doubting of the Lawfulneſs of abiding with their unbelieving Husbands and Wives: And to ſatisfy them about this Matter, he tells them, the unbelieving Husband was ſanctified by (or rather *to*) the believing Wife, *&c.* that is ſet apart or conſecrated to each other in lawful Marriage, (for 'tis doubtleſs no other Sanctification) *elſe were your Children unclean*, that is, Baſtards; *but now are they holy*, that is, lawfully begotten. And we find divers Learned Men give the ſame Expoſition on theſe Words. *Ambroſe* on the Place ſaith, *The Children are Holy, becauſe born of lawful Marriage.* See *Melanchthon* on this Text, who aſſerts the ſame. *Eraſmus* ſaith, *Children are legitimately Holy, the Converſion of Husband or Wife did not diſſolve the Marriage.* To which I might add *Camerarius*, and divers others. We We read in *Zachary*, that the Bells and *Pots of the Lord's Houſe were holy*; may be the Papiſts from thence preſume to baptize Bells, and they have as much reaſon ſo to do, as there is by the Authority of God's Word for any to baptize Infants. As touching what you ſpeak of little Children coming to Chriſt, that the Original or Greek Word is the ſame with προσηλθειν to proſelyte, what ſignifies that? how often is that Word mentioned in other Places, to ſignify any manner of coming to? *&c.* 'Tis a ſtrange way of proſelyting Perſons, and never to teach or inſtruct them. See theſe Scriptures where the ſame Word is uſed: Προσηλθεν αυτῳ, Mat. 26. 7. *There came unto him.* Mat. 26. 17. *The Diſciples came*; Gr. προσηλθον οἱ μαθηται. Mat. 26. 49. *Forthwith he came to Jeſus*; Gr. καὶ εὐθεως προσελθων τῳ Ιησου. Mat. 26. 69. *There came unto him* (a Girl or) *a Damſel*; Gr. προσηλθεν αυτῳ μια παιδισκη. Mat. 26. 73. *And after a while* (or a while after) *came unto him they that ſtood by*; Gr. μετα μικρον οἱ προσελθοντες ἑστωτες.

But you proceed further to prove Infants ought to be baptized, and that from the Univerſal Conſent of the Churches in all Countries: For (as you ſay) *Tertul. de præſcriptur. hæret.* ch. 28. *Eſquid veriſimile*, &c. Had the Chur-

Churches erred, they would have varied, &c.

Reply. If you cannot prove Infant-Baptism from Scripture, you are gone for ever; for this Argument of yours to prove it is like that of the Papists, to prove their Church the true Church, *viz. Universality* and *Antiquity*, &c. It was not the Practice of the Churches first planted by the Apostles, that's plain; and 'tis as evident other Errors were as universally received, and some very early too; besides, you can't be ignorant how the Greek Church varies from the Latin.

But pray take what Dr. *Barlow* hath said to this, a worthy Bishop of the Church of *England*. 'I believe, and know, saith he, 'that there is neither Precept nor Exam-'ple in Scripture for Pedo-baptism, nor a-'ny just Evidence for it for above 200 years 'after Christ; that *Tertullian* condemns it as 'an unwarrantable Custom, and *Nazianzen* a 'good while after him dislikes it: Sure I 'am, that in the primitive Times, they were '*Catechumeni*, then *illuminati* or *Baptizati*, 'and that not only Pagans and Children of Pa-'gans converted, but Children of Christian 'Parents: The truth is, I do believe Pedo-'Baptism, how or by whom I know not, 'come into the World in the second Cen-'tury, and in the third and fourth began to 'be practised, though not generally, and 'defended as lawful from the Text, *John* 3. 5. 'grossly misunderstood: upon the like gross 'Mistake, *John* 6. 53. they did for many 'Centuries, both in the *Greek* and *Latin* 'Church, communicate Infants, and give them 'the Lord's Supper; and I confess they 'might do both as well as either, *&c.*

Thus both your Arguments from universal Consent and Antiquity, the Learned Doctor hath sufficiently answered. And I rather let him answer you, than to answer you in my own words, thinking what he says, may be more regarded by some than what I say. But to prove from Antiquity, that Infant-Baptism was practised in the first, second and third Centuries, you say you are able to demonstrate, and that there was never any particular Congregation of Anabaptists till about three hundred years after Christ; and seem to build much upon these three last Arguments.

Reply. If you had said there were no Baptized Congregations, *i. e.* such who only baptized Believers, you had asserted a great Untruth, sith all the Primitive Apostolical Churches were such, none being admitted to Baptism for the first and second Centuries, but the Adult, *i. e.* such who professed their Faith, as in due time may be sufficiently proved, notwithstanding all your Flourish and Pretences; but suppose it be granted there were no Congregations till then called Anabaptists, what doth that signify? it was because there were not till about that time any (as Dr. *Barlow* and divers others say) who practised Pedo-baptism. Baptists could not be called Anabaptists, or Re-baptizers, till there were some who held for Infant-Baptism; so that this directly makes against you. Moreover, many Rites which you disown as human Traditions, crept very early into the World, and were practised generally too in the Apostacy of the Church.

Quest. 3. *Whether Infant-Baptism is to be found in the Scripture?*

1. You answer, not expressly in the Letter, but from necessary and unavoidable Consequences, as you say you have already shewn.

Reply. 'Tis a hard case that one of the great Sacraments of the Lord Jesus should in your Thoughts, lie so dark and obscure in the New Testament, that it can't be proved from it but by Consequences; but harder that Learned Men of your way, should affirm that your Consequences for it, drawn from those Texts you mention, are not natural, and prove nothing; besides, you can't be ignorant that the first Asserters of Infant-Baptism never undertook the proof of it from such Scripture-Grounds or Consequences, but from the Authority and Power of the Church: for, as you think the Church hath power to change the Act of Baptizing unto Sprinkling, to

they affirmed she had like Power to change the Subject, and instead of Believers, to baptize Infants who have no Understanding. Pray what Precept of the Mosaical Law lay so dark or obscure, that it could not be proved without Consequences? Did not *Moses* make every Law, Precept or Command plain, that he that runs might read it? and yet Christ is said to exceed *Moses*, being faithful as a Son over his own House, *Heb.* 3. Those Consequences you have drawn, all impartial Men may see prove nothing.

Moreover, what you speak about those great Articles of the Christian Religion, as if they could not be proved without Consequences, must not by any means be allowed; nor can I take it to be true. Cannot we find the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Scripture, and that Christ is God and the second Person, and that he was born of the Virgin, without Consequences? Is it Wisdom in you in such a corrupt Age as this is, to lay down such Assertions? Were those things the Matter of Controversy between you and me, you should hear what positive and plain Scripture Proof might (as you know hath often already) be brought upon that account. But to pass by this, I affirm the Baptism of Believers lies plain in God's Word, but Infant-Baptism is not to be found therein.

Quest. 4. *Why was not Christ baptized before he was thirty Years old?*

You answer, From the same Reason that the Jailor, the Eunuch, and *St. Peter*'s Converts were not, *viz.* there is no adhering to a Doctrine before it is instituted or preached; but, say you, Infant Baptism was much before our Saviour's time, as amongst those of riper Years since, and that, you say, is Proof enough.

Reply. It can't be Proof enough to answer the Question, and as to prove Infant-Baptism it utterly fails; but if Infant-Baptism was much before our Saviour's time as an Institution of God, there was no Want of an Institution when he was a Babe; and therefore your Reason why he deferred his Baptism is gone. Was it in being long before, and yet not instituted or appointed by *Jehovah*? Do you not herein implicitly confess that Custom amongst the Jews was humane? Nor will it serve your turn to say, it was instituted a-new as a Gospel-Ordinance, because you affirm Baptism under the Gospel was the Continuation of that old Custom, with the *Super-addition of the full Force of Baptism, viz. a Confignation or Seal of the Covenant.* Do you not intimate it was not instituted anew, but rather a Custom continued? upon which you (with that Addition, and some others before you) seem to lay the great Stress of your Infants Baptism. And if some Additions were made to the old Custom, why might there not be some Diminutions also? and if it were a-new instituted, it is all one as if it had never been in being before; for the Right any have to Baptism and manner of Administration, and all things appertaining to it, must of necessity wholly depend upon the new Institution or Law of Christ: If therefore Gospel-Baptism wholly depends on the new Institution, then the old Custom is gone for ever (had it been a Mosaical Rite) like a Legacy bequeathed in a Will, made void by the Testator's last Will and Testament; though some part of the same thing may be repeated in the last Will, that was in the first, yet the last must decide the Controversy: but in Christ's last Will and Testament, Infant-Baptism is not to be found, nor was it indeed an Ordinance ordained of God before Christ's time. See my Answer about this in Answer to the first Question.

2. Certainly had it been the Will of God, Children should have been baptized as such, Christ had been baptized when in his Infancy; no doubt God who is a free Agent could not want an Administrator; he could have sent *John* into the World sooner, or have commissionated some other Person to have done it. But since the Holy Ghost in the Gospel relates the time of his Baptism, and that it was not till he was about thirty Years old, it clearly shews us that adult Persons ought to be admitted to that Ordinance only, and not

Babes:

Babes: By which Example of his he hath ſtrengthned his Commiſſion, or at leaſt wiſe ſhewed the Congruity or ſweet Agreement there is between this Precept and his own Practice.

Queſtion 5. *Why Sprinkling, and not Dipping?* You anſwer, Our Church denies not the latter, (that is, Dipping) but looks upon it as a clear Repreſentation of our Saviour's deſcending into the Grave, abiding there, and riſing up again, *&c.*

But ſay you, the Church has power to diſpenſe with Circumſtantials and manner of Acting, tho not with the Act it ſelf, *&c.*

Reply. What your Church is I know not; the Church of *England* doth acknowledg, I muſt confeſs, that Baptiſm is Dipping, but I never heard they have of late times ſo practiſed. But how dare you ſay, the Church hath power to diſpenſe with Dipping, and change it into Sprinkling? Who gave her ſuch Power? Where do you read of it? You call it a Circumſtantial, but I am not of your Mind; I muſt ſay 'tis an Eſſential; nay, 'tis no Baptiſm at all, if not Dipping; for *Baptizo* is to dip, which to confirm, I could give you a Cloud of Witneſſes learned in the Greek Tongue; therefore 'tis not the manner of the Act, but the Act it ſelf; to baptize is one Act, and to rantize or ſprinkle Water is another; the manner of the Act of dipping, or baptizing, is to put the whole Body into the Water backward, or forward, [illegible] ways, or with a ſwift or gentle Motion. [illegible] is dipping, and ſprinkling ſprinkling, which Act will never be baptizing whilſt the World ſtands. You ſay well, dipping or burying the Body in the Water, is a clear and lively Repreſentation of the Death, Burial and Reſurrection of Chriſt. And hence 'tis ſaid, that ſuch who are indeed baptized, *are buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm.* To which you might have added, 'tis alſo a Sign of our being dead to Sin, and of our *being raiſed up with Chriſt by the Faith of the Operation of God, to walk in newneſs of Life.*

And hence I infer, Infants ought not to be baptized, becauſe there doth not, cannot appear in them that glorious internal Work of the Spirit which ought to be ſignified thereby; and as they for this reaſon cannot be the proper Subjects of Baptiſm: So likewiſe it cannot be done by Sprinkling, becauſe that Act cannot repreſent thoſe Signs and Goſpel-Myſteries, which the Law-giver intended ſhould be held forth in that holy Adminiſtration.

But why do you ſay this is a circumſtantial Thing? Was not *Nadab* and *Abihu*'s Tranſgreſſion, and that of *Uzzah*'s, more like Circumſtantials than this is? and yet their Error coſt them their Lives. Or, hath the Goſpel-Church a greater diſpenſing Power in ſuch Caſes, than the Church had under the Law? ——Suppoſe the Jews ſhould have changed Circumciſion, or cutting off the Foreskin of the Fleſh, to the paring the Nails of their Children, or to cut off a little Skin off of the Fingers Ends; would that have been Circumciſion? no doubt a better Circumciſion than Sprinkling is Baptiſm. Gentlemen, will you call any Part, or Branch, or Thing that appertains to a poſitive Precept, a Circumſtance which the Church has power to diſpenſe with? If you ſhould, whither would this lead you? You may after that Notion ſtrangely curtail Chriſt's Inſtitutions in other reſpects.

Queſtion 6. *What think you of thoſe that die in Infancy unbaptized?*

You anſwer, Of ſuch *are the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Reply. So ſaith our bleſſed Saviour, but they have, ſay I, no Right thereto, or belong unto the Kingdom of Heaven, becauſe ſprinkled with a little Water; nor would they have any further Right, ſhould they be indeed baptized, ſince there is no Command of God for it.

Queſt. 7. *If Children be ſaved whether baptized or not, what ſignifies Baptiſm?*

You anſwer, 'tis a Badg of Chriſt, an evident Note of Diſtinction from the Children of Infidels: and as we come to the Knowledg

ledg of ſpiritual Things by Senſe, ſo 'tis an Evidence of a greater aſſurance of the Favour of God to them, being inviſibly introduced into the Covenant of Grace.

Reply. 'Tis no Badg of Chriſt beſure, becauſe he never gave it to them; and if it be an evident Note of Diſtinction from the Children of Infidels, 'tis wholly of Man's making. You know what wonderful things are aſcribed to Chriſm by the *Papiſts*, who uſe Salt, Oil and Spittle, *&c.* in Baptiſm, and to other deviſed Rites and Ceremonies uſed by them; and I have as much ground from God's Word to believe what they ſay, as what you ſay, who affirm and prove not; why, do you not ſay they are thereby made *Members of Chriſt, Children of God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven?* Pray, what can aſſurance can that give them of the Favour of God, unleſs he had appointed it, and imparted ſome ſpiritual Grace thereby to them? Nay, and what Arguments do you bring to prove they thereby are introduced into the Covenant of Grace? Can any outward Act bring or introduce People either young or old into the Covenant of Grace, if they are brought thereby into the Covenant of Grace? I hope they ſhall all be ſaved that are baptized (as you call it.) I hope you are not for falling away, or that any Soul who is in the Covenant of Grace ſhall periſh eternally. Moreover, how can they come to the knowledg of ſpiritual Things by Senſe? indeed in the caſe of Circumciſion, which left a Mark in the Fleſh, they might more probably underſtand by the ſight of the Eye, thoſe ſpiritual Things ſignified by it; but Baptiſm leaves no ſuch Mark: Nothing appears to their Senſes when they come to knowledg that can have any ſuch Tendency; I fear rather it is a great means when they are grown up, to blind their Eyes, and cauſe them to think (as many ignorant People do) that they are made thereby Chriſtians, and ſo in a ſaved State, and never look after the Work of Regeneration.

Queſt. 8. *Whether have Children Faith or no, ſince Faith and Repentance are Prerequiſites to Baptiſm?*

Your Anſwer is, That you have ſhewed, that according to the words of the Commiſſion, Baptizing goes before Teaching; therefore there is not ſuch a Prerequiſiteneſs as ſome dream of. You have ſaid ſo I muſt confeſs from the Commiſſion, but have not proved it, but rather made work for Repentance, by ſtriving to invert the Order of the ſacred Commiſſion of our Saviour, *&c.* But ſay you admit Faith as pre-requiſite to Baptiſm; we could anſwer, that Children have Faith *potentia*, tho not in *actu viſibili*: As an Artiſt when he is indiſpoſed or aſleep, is *potentially* an Artiſt, tho not actually.—

Reply. Strange you ſhould attempt to affirm Children have Faith *potentia!* Who told you ſo? when was this imaginary Faith infuſed into them? it muſt be either by Nature, Art, or Grace, or elſe your Simily is loſt. You are look'd upon indeed to be Philoſophers, but this is above my Underſtanding, or your own Illuſtration. But you ſuppoſe that Paſſage in *Matth.* 18. doth your buſineſs: whereas 'tis evident that our Saviour ſpeaks there of ſuch little ones who were indeed capable to believe; it was not ſuch a little one as you would have baptized. We doubt not but God doth oft-times infuſe Grace very early in the Souls of ſome very young, and calls them to believe, [illegible] to the knowledg [illegible] Truth; but what is this to all Infants [illegible] neral? But more fully to anſwer what you ſay about Children having Faith, take what Dr. *Taylor* hath wrote upon this Conceit. 'Whether Infants have 'Faith or no, is a Queſtion (ſaith he) 'to be diſputed by Perſons that care not 'how much they ſay, and how little they 'prove.

1. 'Perſonal and Actual Faith they have 'none, for they have no Acts of Under'ſtanding: and beſides, how can any Man 'know that they have, ſince he never ſaw 'any Sign of it, neither was he told ſo by 'any that could tell?

2. 'Some

2. 'Some say they have imputative Faith, 'but then so let the Sacrament be too; that 'is, if they have the Parents Faith, or the 'Churches, then so let Baptism be imputed 'also by derivation from them: and as in 'their Mothers Womb, and while they hung 'on their Mothers Breasts, they live upon 'their Mothers Nourishment; so they may 'upon the Baptism of their Parents, or their 'Mother the Church: for since Faith is ne-'cessary to the susception of Baptism, and they 'themselves confess it, by striving to find out 'new kinds of Faith to dawb the matter 'up; such as the Faith, such must be the 'Sacrament: for there is no Proportion be-'tween an actual Sacrament and an impu-'tative Faith, this being in immediate and 'necessary order to that. And whatsoever 'can be said to take from the Necessity of 'actual Faith, all that and much more may 'be said to excuse from the actual suscepti-'on of Baptism. The first of these De-'vices was that of *Luther* and his Scholars; 'the second of *Calvin* and his; and yet there 'is a third Device which the Church of 'Rome teaches, and that is, that Infants have 'habitual Faith, but who told them so? how 'can they prove it? what Revelation or 'Reason teaches any such thing? are they by 'this Habit so much as disposed to an actual 'Belief without a new Master? Can an 'Infant sent into a Mahometan Province be 'more confident for Christ [illegible] when he 'comes to be a Man, than if he had not 'been baptized? are there any Acts prece-'dent, concomitant or consequent to this 'pretended Habit? This strange Invention is 'absolutely without Art, without Scripture, 'Reason or Authority, but the Men are to 'be excused unless there were a better.

And again to this purpose, *pag.* 242. 'And if any Man runs for Succour to that 'exploded *Crespingeton*, that Infants have 'Faith, or any other inspired Habit of I 'know not what or how, we desire no 'more advantage in the World than that 'they are constrained to answer without 'Revelation, against Reason, common Sense, 'and all the Experience in the World.

As to what you speak as to those young Children you mention, it prowes nothing; and some of your Stories seem childish, and do not look as if they came from Men of such pretended Ingenuity.

But to close all; We have the worst of you at the last, wherein you in a very scurrilous manner cast Reproach upon a great Body of Godly People (who differ not from other Orthodox Christians in any Essentials of Salvation, no nor in Fundamentals of Church-Constitutions, save in the Point of Baptism) and will you by reason of the Enormities of some who formerly bore the Name of Anabaptists, mentioning the old *Munster* Story, condemn as such all that bear that Name?

In Answer to which I ask you, whether the like Reflections might not have been cast on Christ's Apostles, because they had a *Judas* among them? or on the Church of the *Corinthians*, because of the incestuous Person? Besides, you know not but it may be a Lie raised upon those People by the envious Papists, who have rendred *Calvin* and *Luther* as odious as you do these Anabaptists. You would think it hard, if I should ask you what sort they were that *Ralph Wallis* used to expose, and fill his Carts with? or of those Clergy-men who were Pedo-Baptists, yet were for filthy Crimes executed.

To conclude, I wish that all Bitterness of Spirit was expelled, Love and Charity exercised towards all, tho in some things we may differ from one another.

Queries for the Athenian Society to Answer, some of which were formerly sent to them, but were passed by in silence. 1. Whether Infants are the Subjects of Baptism. *And*, 2. Whether Baptism is Dipping or Sprinkling.

First; WHether there was not a twofold Covenant made with *Abraham*, one with his Fleshly Seed, and the other with his Spiritual Seed, signified by the Bond-Woman and the Free-Woman, and their Sons *Ishmael* and *Isaac*?

If so, I query, Whether Circumcision was an Ordinance that appertained to the Covenant of Grace, and was the Seal of it? 1. Because 'tis contradistinguished from the Covenant of Grace, or free Promise of God, *Rom.* 4. 2. And 'tis also called a Yoke of Bondage. And, 3. 'Tis said also, that he *that was circumcised, was a Debter to keep the whole Law.* And, 4. Because *Ishmael*, who was not a Child of the Covenant of Grace with *Esau*, and many others, yet were required to be circumcised as well as *Isaac*. And, 5. Since 'tis positively said Faith was imputed to *Abraham* for Righteousness not in Circumcision, *How was it imputed then, when he was circumcised, or uncircumcised? not when he was circumcised, but when he was uncircumcised.* Rom. 4. 10.

Secondly; Whether the being the Male-Children of Believers, as such, gave them right to Circumcision, or not rather the meer positive Command of God to *Abraham*; since we do not read of any other Godly Man's Seed in *Abraham*'s days, or since, had any right thereto, but only such who were born in his House, or bought with his Mony?

Thirdly; Whether Circumcision could be said to be the Seal of any Man's Faith save *Abraham*'s only, seeing 'tis said, *he received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith he had* [mark] *yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all that believe*; which was the Privilege of *Abraham* only: for how could Circumcision be a Seal to Children of that Faith they had before circumcised, seeing they had no Faith at all, as had *Abraham* their Father, they being obliged by the Law of God to be circumcised at eight days old?

Fourthly; What is it which you conceive Circumcision did, or Baptism doth seal to Children, or make sure; since a Seal usually makes firm all the Blessings or Priviledges contained in that Covenant 'tis prefix'd to? Doubtless if the Fleshly Seed of Believers, as such, are in the Covenant of Grace, and have the Seal of it, they shall be saved, because we are agreed, that the Covenant of Grace is well ordered in all things, and sure, there is no final falling, therefore how should any of them miss of eternal Life? and yet we see many of them prove wicked and ungodly, and so live and die. If you say it seals only the external Part and Priviledges of the Covenant of Grace:

Fifthly; I demand to know what those External Priviledges are, seeing they are denied the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper, and all other External Rites whatsoever? if you say when they believe they shall partake of [illegible] Blessings; so, say I, shall the Children [illegible] believers as well as they.

Sixthly; If the Fleshly Seed, or Children of believing Gentiles, as such, are to be accounted the Seed of *Abraham*; I query, Whether they are his Natural Seed, or his Spiritual Seed? if not his Natural Seed, nor his Spiritual Seed, what right can they have to Baptism, or Church-Membership, from any Covenant-Transactions God made with *Abraham*? ——

Seventhly; Whether those different grounds upon which the Right of Infant-Baptism is pretended by the Fathers of old, and the Modern Divines, doth well agree with an Institution that is a meer positive Rite, depending wholly on the Will of the Legislator, doth

doth not give just cause to all to question its Authority?

1. Some Pedo-Baptists asserted, It took away Original Sin, and such who denied it were anathematized.

2. Some affirm, That Children are in the Covenant; and being the Seed of Believers, are federally Holy, therefore ought to be Baptized.

3. Another sort of Pedo Baptists say, They ought to be Baptized, by virtue of their Parents Faith.

4. Others affirm, They have Faith themselves, and are Disciples, and therefore must be baptized.

5. Another sort Baptize them upon the Faith of their Sureties.

6. And another sort of Pedo Baptists say, It wholly depends upon the Power and Authority of the Church.

7. [illegible] Apostolical unwritten [illegible] say that, affirm [illegible] from the Word of God.

[illegible] Institution, the [illegible] thus divided and [illegible] themselves.

Eighthly; Is it not an evil thing, and very absurd for any to say, Baptism is a Symbol of present Regeneration, and yet apply it to Babes, in whom nothing of the things signified thereby doth or can appear? And also to say, *I Baptize thee in the Name*, &c. when indeed he doth not Baptize, but only Rantize the Child? and to say Baptism is a lively Figure of Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, and yet only sprinkle or pour a little Water upon the Face of the Child?

Ninthly; Whether that can be an Ordinance of Christ, for which there is neither Command nor Example in all the Word of God, nor any Promise made to such who do it, nor Threats denounced on such who neglect it or do it not? For though there are both Promises made to Believers Baptized, and Threats denounced on such who neglect it, yet where are there any such in respect of Infant-Baptism?

Tenthly; Whether a Pagan, or Indian, who should attain to the knowledg of the Greek Tongue, or of the English, or any other Tongue into which the Original should be translated, by reading over the New Testament a thousand times, he could ever find Infants ought to be Baptized; if not, how doth it appear the Faith of People about Pedo-Baptism stands in the Power of God, and knowledg of his Word, and not rather in the Wisdom of Men, who having endeavoured, with all the Art and Cunning they can, to draw pretended Consequences for it, tho after all they do not naturally and genuinely follow from the Premises to which they refer?

Eleventhly; Whether Christ having expressly mentioned the Qualifications of such as are to be Baptized, *viz.* actual Repentance, Faith, and the Answer of a good Conscience, doth not thereby exclude all those who are not capable of those Qualifications?

Twelfthly; Whether it doth not reflect upon the Care, Wisdom, and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, who as a Son over his own House, exceeded the Care and Faithfulness of *Moses*, to affirm, Infants ought to be Baptized, and yet it cannot be found in all the New Testament? Can it be thought it should be a Gospel-precept, nay, a Sacrament, and yet Christ speak nothing of it? or could it be in the Commission, and yet the Apostles never to mention it, but contrariwise, require Faith of all they admitted to Baptism? *Paul* says, He declared the whole Counsel of God, and said nothing of it in any of his Epistles, nor any where else. How many thousands of Children were born to baptized Believers, from the time of Christ's Ascension, to the time *John* wrote the *Revelations*, but not one word of any one Child Baptized?

Thirteenthly; Whether in matter of positive Right, such as Baptism is, we ought not to keep expressly and punctually to the Revelation of the Will of the Law-giver?

Fourteenthly; Whether the Baptism of Infants be not a dangerous Error, since it tends to deceive and blind the Eyes of poor ignorant People, who think they are thereby made Christi-

Christians, and so never look after Regeneration, nor true Baptism, which represents or signifies that inward Work of Grace upon the Heart?

Fifteen; Whether the Ancient Church, who gave the Lord's Supper to Infants, as well as Baptism, might not be allowed as well to do the one as the other, since Faith and Holy Habits are as much required in those who are to be Baptized, as in such who come to the Lord's Table? And all such in the Apostolick Church, who were Baptized, were immediately admitted to break Bread, *&c.* And also the Arguments taken from the Covenant, and because said to be Holy, and to *belong to the Kingdom of Heaven*, are as strong for them to receive the Lord's Supper, there being no Command nor Example for either, and human Tradition carrying it equally for both for several Centuries.

Sixteen; Whether *Nadab*, *Abihu*, and *Uzzah*'s Transgressions were not as much Circumstantials, and so as small Errors, as to alter Dipping into Sprinkling; and from an understanding Believer, to a poor ignorant Babe? And whether to allow the Church a Power to make such Alterations, be not dangerous? see *Rev.* 22. And doth not it open a Door to other Innovations?

Seventeen; Whether there is any just Cause for Men to vilify and reproach the People called *Anabaptists*, for their baptizing Believers, and denying Infants to be Subjects thereof, seeing they have the plain and direct Word of God to warrant their practice, *i. e.* not only the Commission, but also the continual usage of the Apostles and Ministers of the Gospel all along in the New Testament, who Baptized none but such who made profession of their Faith? And the Church of *England* also saith, *Faith and Repentance are required of such who are to be Baptized.* We dare not Baptize our Children, because we cannot find it written; 'tis from the holy Fear of God, lest we should offend and sin against him, by adding to his Word.

Eighteen; What should be the reason that our faithful Translators of the Bible should leave the Greek word *Baptism*, or *Baptisma*, and not turn it into English, seeing the Dutch have not done so, but contrariwise translate, for *John the Baptist*, *John the Dooper*; and for *he Baptized*, *he dooped*, or *dipped them*?

Nineteen; Whether those who translate out of one Language into another, ought not to translate every word into the same Language into which they turn it, and not leave any word in the same Original Tongue, which the People understand not, and for whose sakes they undertook that Work; and not to translate every word, but also to give the right, literal, genuine and proper signification of each word, and not the remote, improper, or collateral signification of it? Which if our Translators of the Bible had so done, I query whether the Doubt among the Unlearned, concerning what the word *Baptisma* signifies, had not ceased?

Twenty; Seeing the Greek Church uses Immersion & not Aspersion, may it not be look'd upon as a great Argument against Sprinkling, especially seeing they disown the Baptism of the Latin Church, because they use Sprinkling; for doubtless the Greeks best knew the genuine and proper signification of that word, that Tongue being their own natural Language in which the New Testament was wrote?

21. Whether if a Minister should administer the Lord's Supper in one kind only, and so doing, it cannot answer the great Design of Christ the Law-giver, *i. e.* the breaking of his Body, and shedding of his Blood, would not prophane that Holy Institution? If so, whether such, who instead of dipping the whole Body, do but sprinkle or pour a little Water on the Face, do not also prophane the holy Sacrament of Baptism, since it is not so done to represent in a lively Figure the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, with our Death unto Sin, and vivification unto newness of Life? *Rom.* 6. *Col.* 2. 11, 12.

22. Whether all such who have only been sprinkled, ought not to be deemed Unbaptized Persons, since Aspersion is not Immersion,

sion, or Rantizing not Baptizing? for though the Greek word *Baptiko*, in a remote and improper sense may signify *to wash*, yet, as the Learned confess, it is such a washing as is done by dipping, swilling, or plunging the Person or Thing all over in the Water.

23. Since you say Children have Faith *potentia*: I query, Whether Unbelievers, and all ungodly Persons, have not also the like Faith *potentia* as well as Children, and so the same Right to Baptism? We grant they may have Faith hereafter; what tho?

There is one Assertion and Argument laid down by you, that I omitted in my Answer; which as it is New, so it must needs expose you, *viz. If God be pleased to radiate or shine upon the Souls of Children in Heaven, and they do behold the Face of God, as our Saviour says; then it follows that they have Faith in Heaven, and why not on Earth? see* Heb. 11. 27. These are your very words.

Reply; I had thought that in Heaven the Faith of the Adult ceases, *i. e.* the strong and saving Faith of Believers: Doth not the Apostle say, Then we come to receive the End of our Faith? And is not Faith turned there into Vision? Is not Faith *the Evidence of Things not seen, and the Substance of Things hoped for?* Heb. 11. 1. Divines say, Faith, Hope, *&c.* cease then, and that 'tis only Love that continues. What is it they have not received in Heaven, which they trust in God for? Nor is your Conclusion good, Had they Faith there, they may have it here. The Text you cite, *Heb.* 11. 27. refers to that Faith *Moses* had on Earth, who saw him that was Invisible. God seems so to us here; but what a sight we shall have of him in Heaven, we know not. Doth not the Apostle say, we *shall behold Face to Face*; *and the pure in Heart shall see God?* Shall that be such a sight that *Moses* had whilst on Earth?

Questions relating to the Fathers, with respect to the Controversy about Infant-Baptism.

First;

WHat reason can be given why *Nazianzen*, an eminent Greek Father, should counsel the deferring the Baptism of Infants, until the third or fourth Year of their Age, (except in danger of Death), if it were in *Nazianzen*'s Time, as some suppose it was, the Opinion of the whole Church, as also his own, that Infants, by an Apostolical Tradition, were to be baptized as such, that is, as soon as born?

Secondly; Whether all the Fathers of the third and fourth Century, both of the Greek and Latin Church, who have wrote any thing about Infant-Baptism, do not unanimously give this as the Reason why Infants should be Baptized, *viz.* the washing away Original Sin, or the putting them into a Capacity of Salvation; and some of them, particularly St. *Austin*, sentencing Infants to Eternal Damnation if not Baptized?

Thirdly; If so, Whether the Fathers might not be mistaken in the Right of Infants to Baptism, as well as the Judgment of most Protestants they are, in the Reason why they should be Baptized?

Four other Queries.

1. WHether God hath allowed or enjoined Parents to bring their little Babes, of two or ten days old, into a Covenant with him by Baptism, since 'tis not to be found in the Scripture he either hath allowed or enjoined them so to do?

2. If it cannot be proved he hath required any such thing at their Hands, Whether that Covenant can be said to bind their Consciences when they come to Age, especially since they gave no Consent to it, nor were capable so to do?

3. If this pretended Covenant was not of God's Appointment, I query, how these Children who refuse to agree to the said Covenant when at Age, can thereby be guilty, 1. Of rejecting Christ, 2. Of renouncing the Bleſſings of the Goſpel, 3. And that 'tis Rebellion continued againſt their Maker, 4. That 'tis Ingratitude and Injury to their Redeemer, 5. Groſs Injuſtice to their Parents, 6. That 'tis ſelf-killing Cruelty to their own Souls, 7. And a damning Sin?

4. I query, whether this be good Divinity, not rather a ſtrange Doctrine? And whether unwarrantable Articles of Faith, taken out of the Jewiſh *Talmud*, or Turkiſh *Alcoran*, may not by as good Authority be put into a *Chriſtian Catechiſm*, as ſuch Aſſertions as theſe?

Four Queries ſent by another Hand to the Athenian Society.

Gentlemen,

I Humbly conceive, that no Man knoweth what is a Duty but by the Scriptures: And ſince Pedo-Baptiſm cannot be proved by the Word of God, as every Man may know, and is generally acknowledged by the moſt Learned Aſſertors of that Practice; it therefore plainly followeth, in my Judgment, that Infant-Baptiſm is no Ordinance of God's Appointment, but an Innovation.

I therefore ſeriouſly query;

I. *WHether Tradition, Jewiſh Talmuds, the Opinion of private Doctors, Schoolmen*, &c. *be a ſufficient Warrant for the Churches to eſtabliſh ſuch a Practice, that hath neither Precept nor Example in the Holy Scriptures?*

II. *Since the pretended Foundation of Infant-Baptiſm*, (viz. *its abſolute neceſſity to Salvation*) *proving to be a Miſtake of the Text*, John 3. 5. *as is generally acknowledged by Proteſtants, Whether the Structure ought not to fall with it, as it did in the Caſe of giving the Child the Euchariſt?*

III. *Whether the Faith of the Parent, or Goſſip, on the Child's behalf, be required of God, or will be imputed to the Child by God? If not, why ventured on, and not rather a waiting for Faith in the Subject, as required in Holy Writ, by the Apoſtles and Primitive Churches, and ſeemingly by the Church of* England *in her Catechiſm?*

IV. *Whether the Church hath a good Warrant that will juſtify her before God, in changing the Mode from Dipping to Sprinkling? and whether that Alteration doth ſo well anſwer the Deſign of the Holy God, as that Ceremony which himſelf appointed?*

Gentlemen,

I knew nothing of that Gentleman's Animadverſions, or that he, or any Body elſe, intended to take notice of your *Mercury*, till I had wrote what I intended to ſay, tho when it was too late I ſaw it.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

Containing some Remarks upon the Athenian Mercury, *Vol.* 4. *Numb.* 18. *published* Saturday, *Novemb.* 28. 1691.

Gentlemen,

JUST as my Answer to your first *Mercury* about Infant-Baptism was finished, and almost printed off, your second Paper on the same Subject came to my Hand: And tho I was not concerned in the Paper called, *Animadversions on your other Mercury*; yet, till a further Answer is prepared, I shall make some Reflections upon what you have said in your pretended *Reply* to that Gentleman, *&c.*

1. *Sirs*, You go too fast to conclude, you by that Paper understand wherein our strength lies, as (by this time) you may perceive, nor don't conclude you have it all yet.

2. What you say about your pretended Proof of Infant-Baptism, from that unscriptural Tradition or Custom among the Jews of proselyting whole Families to the Jewish Religion by Baptism, you may see fully answered before I saw your last *Mercury*. Have you proved that Custom among them was *Jure Divino?* or, if so, that it remained and was continued by Christ?

Secondly; What you have said about Baptism, being the proper Antitype of Circumcision, is also answered: Nor does what you speak of Types and Antitypes, not agreeing in every thing, help you. Have not we shewed that the proper Antitype of Circumcision in the Flesh is that of the Heart?

Thirdly; As to your Logical Argument, (*viz. An Ordinance once enjoined, and never repealed, is always in force; but the Ordinance of Childrens incovenanting, was once in the Old Testament enjoined, and was never repealed.* Ergo). We answer, If the Ordinance of Children incovenanting under the Law, was Circumcision, that Ordinance is repealed; Is not Circumcision repealed?

2. If you say notwithstanding, Children of the Flesh, or the natural Seed, being once in the Covenant, and never cast out, (by reason that Law or Covenant, for their incovenanting being not repealed) is always in force.

Reply 1. That the Old or first Covenant, for their incovenanting is repealed is plain; he *took away the first, that he might establish the second.*

2. Also 'tis said, that *Hagar* and her Son are cast out, *viz.* the legal Covenant, and fleshly Seed, and no new Law is added to bring them into the Gospel-Church by Baptism, *i. e.* the fleshly or natural Seed, as such. *Now is the Ax laid to the Root of the Trees.*

Fourthly; Your citing *Heb.* 8. and *Jer.* 31. to shew what Baptism seals to Infants, proves nothing. We deny not, but all who are actually in the New Covenant, *viz.* by Faith ingrafted into Christ, have right to Remission and Salvation; and that that Covenant secures and preserves them to Eternal Life; therefore the Children of Believers, as such, are not in it: And if they are no otherwise in it than conditionally, that is, if they repent, believe, *&c.* I ask you what Priviledg that is, more than what the Children of Heathens and Infidels have? for if they believe and repent, shall they not have the same Blessings & Priviledges of the Covenant also? As to the Adult Professors, we say, if they fall finally away, it shews they never indeed were in the Covenant of Grace. As to Adult true Believers, the Holy Spirit seals Remission and Salvation to them, and they shall be saved; a sign of what is actually in them, is held forth in Baptism, there being nothing signified by that Ordinance as to a Death unto Sin, but what they experienced wrought on

their

their Souls before Baptized; tho, 'tis true, they thereby, for the time to come, covenant to walk in newneſs of Life.

Fifthly; As touching the great Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. where you urge Baptizing goes before Teaching, we have fully anſwered you in the precedent *Reply*; we prove, there is a Teaching goes before Baptiſm, and yet alſo a Teaching after. Why do you attempt to blind the Eyes of the unwary Reader?

Sixthly; To what purpoſe do you mention *Jairus*'s Daughter? do we deny but that the Parents Faith and Prayer, may procure outward Bleſſings, nay, and ſpiritual Ones too; and as much perhaps for their poor carnal Neighbours and Friends? *My Servant* Job *ſhall pray for you.* The fervent Prayer of a Righteous Man availeth much, but it doth not give Right to their Friends or Children to Baptiſm.

Seventhly; As to your Syriac Tranſlation, that the Jaylor and all the Sons of his Houſe were Baptized: I argue, All his Sons, no doubt, were grown up to Age, becauſe 'tis ſaid, *he believed, with all his Houſe.* If he had Sons grown up, and yet did not believe, then, by your Argument, Unbelievers may be Baptized; but to this ſee our Anſwer.

Eighthly; As to your proof from that Paſſage, *i. e. Suffer little Children to come unto me.* Take the words definitely or indefinitely, it proves nothing for you; for Chriſt Baptized no Child, for with his own Hands he Baptized no Perſon at all; *Joh.* 4. 1, 2. 'twas to lay his Hands upon them, not to Baptize them. Moreover, I have before told you, thoſe little Ones *Mark* 9. 42. were Adult, *Whoſoever ſhall offend one of theſe little Ones that believe in me:* I affirm, our Saviour ſpeaks only of ſuch little Ones as were grown up to ſuch Age, as in very deed did believe in him, and not Babes of two or ten days old. But, you ſay, we would have no Children proſelyted, but ſuch as *Timothy*, &c. To which you anſwer, That according to the Original, thoſe Children that did ἀλλὰ ἔρχεσθαι, which word we have ſhewed ſignifies any common coming, (and may be ſuch who come in their Parents Arms). Let Babes come to Chriſt this way or that, he baptized none of them: I may infer as well, becauſe little Children come or were brought to Chriſt, and of ſuch are the Kingdom of Heaven; therefore they may partake of the Lord's Supper, as you infer they may be Baptized.

Ninthly; Tho the Goſpel did not ſpread into all Nations, *&c.* yet ſure you conclude all were to be baptized in all Nations whereſoever the Goſpel did come, or was preached; or elſe, as we ſay, none in thoſe Nations, but ſuch who were made Diſciples, *i. e.* did believe and repent: for if but ſome in thoſe Nations where the Goſpel comes, were to be Baptized, and not all, and yet more ought ſo to be; then ſuch who are diſcipled firſt: Pray, who are they, or how ſhall we know them to be included in the Commiſſion? For, as Mr. *Baxter* ſaith, If we have it not here, where have we it? this being the great Rule or Charter of the Church for this Rite, unto which we ought to adhere in this Matter.

Tenthly; What ſignifies what ſome of the Ancient Fathers believed, *i. e. That Federal Holineſs of Parents made Children Candidates for Baptiſm?* They ſaid, other things too that you decry as well as we, many Errors being early let into the Church: Beſides, we have *Tertullian* againſt *Tertullian*, or one Father againſt another, which is ground enough to believe you abuſe *Tertullian*, or to doubt of the truth of your Hiſtory.

Eleventhly; You *aſk whether Children have not as much right to their Baptiſm as that of Adult Females? for 'tis no where ſaid, ſhe that believeth, and is baptized; where have we one Inſtance of Female-Baptiſm?*

Reply. We ak you whether Male and Female is not intended in *Mark* 16. 16. he or ſhe? and ſo *John* 3. 3. *Unleſs a Man be born again*; the Woman is included; or, have Women no Souls? Did you never read of the Figure *Sylepſis*, or *Conceptio*, that comprehends the leſs worthy under the more worthy, *indignioris ſub dignioris?* as for Example, *Quid tu & ſpurcæ ſuillæ, ego & mater miſeri; permiſtus & uxor quid anſeribus teſtis eſtote?*

and

and it's no leſs true in Divinity; ſee that full and never to be baffled place, *1 Cor.6.16. οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. They two ſhall be one Fleſh.* See *Gen.* 5. 2. *And be called their Name* Adam. Moreover, do we not read *Women* were made Diſciples as well as Men, and ſo had the ſame right to Baptiſm from the Commiſſion.

But to detect your Ignorance of the Scripture, pray ſee *Acts* 8. 12. *When they believed* Philip, *preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, they were baptized both Men and Women.* Alſo *Acts* 16.15. 'tis ſaid *Lydia* was baptized; I thought ſhe had been a Woman. Gentlemen, you ſhew you are but younger Brethren, and will do the Pedobaptiſts no Service; ſhew ſuch a Proof for the Baptiſm of Infants, and your work is done.

But tho Children loſe no ſpiritual Right by Chriſt's coming, yet they may loſe ſome Legal Rites. As Miniſters Sons now are not born to the Miniſtry, as they were under the Law, as well as their Fleſhly Seed had right, as ſuch, to their Jewiſh Church-Membership.

Furthermore; becauſe Believers are made holy by the Operations of the Spirit, are all their Children made holy in like manner alſo? Bluſh for Chriſt's ſake! The Bleſſing of *Abraham's* Sirs, only *comes upon the Gentiles through Faith*, not by natural Generation, as you imagine: As the Bleſſing runs to the Parents, *viz.* through Faith, ſo to their Children; they muſt believe alſo if they would be the Children of the Promiſe, or Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, Gal. 3. *ult.*

Twelfthly; As touching what you ſay further, as *to univerſal Conſent of the Antient Churches*, it proves nothing. Should we believe your Hiſtories, as firmly as we do believe there was an *Alexander* the Great, or a *Cæſar*, &c. if there is no Infant-Baptiſm in the Scripture, 'tis utterly gone: and we challenge you to ſhew from Authentick Hiſtory, that one Infant was baptized in the firſt or ſecond Centuries, which we are not able to diſprove by as good Authority.

Thirtieth; If there was not a Congregation called *Anabaptiſts* till 300 Years after Chriſt, it ſignifies nothing, as we have ſhewed. Moreover, we affirm, that all the Apoſtolical Primitive Churches were Baptiſts, *i. e.* ſuch who only baptized Believers, and ſo continued till the Apoſtacy. See our further Anſwer of this to your firſt *Mercury*. We can prove there was a Teſtimony born againſt Infant-Baptiſm before 380 Years after Chriſt; nay, before the end of the third Century. See *Tertul.* in his Book *de Baptiſmo, c.* 18. who oppoſed Infant-Baptiſm, 1. From the miſtake of that Text, *Mat.* 19. 14. *Suffer little Children to come unto me*; the Lord ſaith, ſays he, *do not forbid them to come unto me*; let them come therefore when they grow elder, when they learn, when they are taught why they come; let them be made Chriſtians when they can know Chriſt.

He adds ſix Arguments more; and to confirm this Teſtimony of *Tertullian*, ſee Dr. *Barlow*; ſaith he, *Tertullian diſlikes and condemns Infant-Baptiſm as unwarrantable and irrational.*

Daillé alſo ſaith, that *Tertullian* was of an Opinion, that Infants were not to be baptized; the like ſay divers others, as Mr. *Danvers* ſhews, which his Oppoſers could not refute.

So that it appears you are ignorant both of Scripture and Hiſtory too, and do but abuſe your ſelves and the World alſo in this matter. Gentlemen, you were better give over, than to freſh to, blow up the Fire and Coal of Contention. You miſtake in your third Column, we are not to prove a Negative, *i. e.* That no Infant was baptized in thoſe Churches, you muſt prove they were.

Fourteen; Your Reply about our Saviour's not being baptized till thirty Years old, it was becauſe he was a Jew, and proſelyted Heathens were only baptized when young. 'Tis a Fig-leaf, ſtill inſiſting upon the old Jewiſh Cuſtom; to which we have given you a full Anſwer.

Fifteen; What you ſay about dipping, and mention ἐμβαπτω τὸ ψωμιον, *and that Authors ſhew that it ſignifies only a bare and ſlight waſhing*,

waſhing, and that plunging and waſhing are very diſtinct: This word comes from the ſame Verb you ſay ſignifies to dip or plunge. And whereas you hint, that *Beza* would have us baptize them, but not drown them; you are reſolved to prevent that danger, who only ſprinkle or rantize them.

I affirm, Dipping or plunging all learned in the Greek Tongue, and Criticks, do generally aſſert, is the literal, proper and genuine Signification of the word βαπτιζω; and if it any where refers to waſhing, 'tis to ſuch a waſhing as is done by dipping or ſwilling in the Water: all ſorts of waſhing are not diſtinct from dipping; and that βαπτιζω to baptize, is to waſh, unleſs it be ſuch a waſhing as is by dipping, we deny: is it not the ſame with טבל? alſo the Septuagint do render the word *Tabal* by βαπτιζω, and which all Tranſlators, ſaith a good Author, both Latin, Dutch, Italian, French and Engliſh, do tranſlate to dip, and always ſignifies to dip, as 2 *Kings* 5. 14, &c.

Grotius ſaith it ſignifies to dip over Head and Ears.

Paſor, an Immerſion, Dipping, or Submerſion.

Leigh in his *Critica Sacra* ſaith, its native and proper Signification is to dip into the Water, or to plunge under the Water; and that it is taken from a Diers Fat, and not a bare Waſhing only: See *Caſaubon*, *Bucan*, *Bullinger*, *Zanchy*, *Beza*, &c.

To cloſe; have we not cauſe to affirm you reproach us, to ſay our *Rivg-Leaders* come to ill Deaths? What ſignifies your Story of *John Bocold* of *Leyden*, and as if *Eraſmus*, &c. had an ill Opinion of the *Anabaptiſts* of his time, does it follow you may vilify the Baptiſts of theſe times from thence? they might hold ſome Errors, and ſo may ſome ſo called now adays, as well as ſome Pedo-Baptiſts, who are *Papiſts*, *Arians*, *Antitrinitarians*, *Socinians*, and what not; and ſome of them debauched Livers, and made as ſhameful Ends; theſe things cannot be unknown to you, but how baſe it is in you thus to write, let all ſober Men judg. Your pretended Zeal will not acquit you from a ſlanderous Tongue, and ſpeaking Evil of them you know not. Are not the Papiſts *Pedobaptiſts*, and ſome of the firſt and chief Aſſertors of it, and what an erronious Crew are they? do you think we cannot parallel *John* of *Leyden* amongſt ſome of the *Pedobaptiſts*. Were thoſe Stories true of him and others? —— are there not ſome bad Men of every Perſwaſion as well as good?

I exhort you to conſider what account you will be able to give, for aſſerting Babies Rantiſm, or Infants Sprinkling, ſince 'tis not commanded of God, &c. in the dreadful Day of Judgment: or how dare you affirm we diſturb the Church of Chriſt with falſe Doctrine, who aſſert, Believers only are the Subjects of Chriſt's true Baptiſm, and that Baptiſm is Immerſion, *i. e.* Dipping, ſince both lies ſo plain in the Word of God? We fear not our appearing upon this account at Chriſt's Tribunal: And for all your great Confidence, your Practice we doubt not in the leaſt will be found to be no Truth of the Goſpel, but an unwarrantable Tradition. What tho Sir *Tho. More*, a Papiſt, was glad he had not proſelyted Perſons to his youthful Errors; muſt we therefore be afraid to promulgate a poſitive Truth of Chriſt?

Is it not ſaid, This Sect is every-where ſpoken againſt?

If you had called for Syllogiſtical Arguments, you might have had them, but you ask for Queries; you may have Logical Arguments anew if you pleaſe, but you had better deſiſt.

To

To conclude with your Poſtſcript.

I Can't ſee Mr. *Eliot* has done the Pedo-Baptiſts any Service, or that any Honour redounds to him for that Work of his.

How in the Goſpel-Church-State, the Promiſe runs to Believers and their Children or Off-ſpring, we have ſhewed; And that Babes of two or ten Days old, are or can be ſaid to be Diſciples, is without proof, and irrational. What though they may belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, or be ſaved, Baptiſm is of a meer poſitive Right; that Argument, I tell you again, will admit them to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as well as to Baptiſm. And as for Antiquity, we deny not but that it was received by divers as an Apoſtolical Tradition, a little time before *Nazianzen* or *Auſtin*; yet that it was preached as neceſſary to Salvation, before *Auſtin* did it, you can't prove, though we deny not but 'twas practiſed before *Auſtin*'s Days. See Dr. *Taylor*, *Lib. Proph.* p. 237. "And the truth of the Buſi-"neſs is, *(ſaith he)* as there was no "Command of Scripture to oblige "Children to the ſuſception of it; So "the neceſſity of Pedo-Baptiſm was "not determined in the Church till "the Canon that was made in the "*Mileventan* Council, a Provincial in "*Africa*, never till then. I grant, "*(ſaith he)* it was practiſed in *A-*"*frica* before that time, and they, "or ſome of them, thought well of "it; and though that is no Argu-"ment for us to think ſo, yet none "of them did ever pretend it to be "neceſſary, nor to have been a Pre-"cept of the Goſpel. St. *Auſtin* "was the firſt that ever preached it "to be neceſſary; and it was in his "Heat and Anger againſt *Pelagius*, "who had ſo warm'd and chafed "him, that made him innovate "herein. Thus far the Doctor.

As to *Clemens*, *Irenæus*, &c. you make ſuch a ſtir about, is contradicted by Hiſtory. *Clemens* aſſerts who are the right Subjects; and in what order they ought, after due Examinations and Inſtructions, to be baptized. See *Jacob Merningus*, in his Hiſtory of Baptiſm, *p.* 2. upon *Cent.* 2. *p.* 209. out of *Clem. Epiſt.* 3. alſo Dutch *Martyrology*.

Ignatius, in his Diſcourſe about Baptiſm, aſſerts, "That it ought to "be accompanied with Faith, Love "and Patience, after preaching; ſee *H. Montanus*, p. 45. and *Jacob Du-*"*bois*, p. 16, to 22. and Dutch *Mar-*"*tyrology*, where *Ignatius*'s Letters are mentioned to *Polycarp Tralienſis*, and to them of *Philadelphia*.

All that we can find of *Ireneus*, is, *Lib. 2. cap. 39. adv. Hæref.* "That "Christ did sanctify every Age by "his own susception of it, and simi- "litude to it, all, I say, who by him "are born again to God. In all which is no word of Infant-Baptism: Unless you wiredraw Consequences from his words, as you do from the Scripture, to support a tottering Structure, built on a false Foundation. That *Ireneus*, or any other but *Origen*'s Testimony was in the case, You have Dr. *Taylor*, in his *Dissuasive against Popery*, p. 118. printed 1667, one of his last Pieces, saying thus, *viz.* "That there is a "Tradition to baptize Infants, relies "but upon two Witnesses, *Origen* "and *Austin*; and the latter having "received it from the former, it relies "upon a single Testimony, which is "but a pitiful Argument to prove a "Tradition Apostolical: He is the "first that spoke it, but *Tertullian*, "that was before him, seems to speak "against it, which he would not have "done, if it had been a Tradition "Apostolical; And that it was not "so, is but too certain, if there be "any Truth in the words of *Ludov.* "*Vives*, saying, That anciently none "were Baptized, but Persons of ri- "per Age.

And as to *Origen*'s Works, there is cause to question, whether they are to be regarded: for Mr. *Perkins* and others doubt about them, because no Greek Copies thereof are extant. And Dr. *Taylor* saith, that many of his Works are Corrupt and Erroneous, particularly in the Point of Baptism, and fell into ill Hands, *&c.*

To conclude, the Learned *Curcellæus*, *Instit. lib. 1. cap. 12.* thus saith, *Pœdobaptismus duobus primis a Christo nato seculis fuit incognitus*, &c. Pedo-Baptism was unknown in the two first Ages after the Birth of Christ, but in the 3*d* and 4*th* it was approved of by a few; in the 5*th* and the following Ages, it began to be generally received. And therefore (as afterward he saith) this Rite is indeed observed by us as an ancient Custom, but not as an Apostolical Tradition.

The same Author, *De peccato Originis*, *Numb.* 56. saith, *Morem Infantes baptizandi non cœpisse ante tertium a Christo nato seculum*, &c. That the Custom of Baptizing Infants, did not begin till the 3*d* Age after Christ; but in the two former, no foottep of it doth appear.

And afterward, (saith he) *Sine ipsius* [*Christi*] *mandato introducta est.* It was introduced without the Command of Christ.

Now let the Reader consider, if our Authority is not greater than the bare Testimony of *Zuinglius*, a late prejudiced Writer.

APPEN-

An Appendix *to the Answer to two Athenian Mercuries, concerning Infant-Baptism, containing divers Syllogistical Arguments to disprove Pedo-Baptism, and to prove the Baptism of Believers.*

Gentlemen,

SInce you desire Syllogisms, I have gratified you therein.

Arg. 1. If none are to be baptized by the Authority of the great Commission of our Blessed Saviour, *Matth.* 28. but such who are first made Disciples by being taught; than Infants, who are not capable to be taught, ought not to be baptized. But none are to be baptized by the Authority of the great Commission of our Blessed Saviour, but such who are first made Disciples by Teaching. *Ergo*, Little Babes ought not to be baptized.

Arg. 2. If Infant-Baptism was never instituted, commanded, or appointed of God, Infants ought not to be baptized. But Infant-Baptism was never instituted, commanded, or appointed of God. *Ergo*, They ought not to be baptized.

As to the *Major*; If one thing may be practised as an Ordinance without an Institution or Command of God, another thing may also; so any Innovation may be let into the Church.

As to the *Minor*; If there is an Institution for it, *&c.* 'tis either contained in the great Commission, *Matth.* 28. *Mark* 16. or somewhere else. But 'tis not to be found in the Commission, nor any where else. *Ergo.*

The *Major* none will deny.

The *Minor* I prove thus. None are to be baptized by virtue of the Commission, but such who are discipled by the Word, as I said before, and so the Greek Word μαθητεύσατε signifies.

If any should say, Christ commanded his Disciples to baptize all Nations, and Infants are part of Nations, therefore are to be baptized. I answer;

Arg. 3. If all Nations, or any in the Nations ought to be baptized before discipled; then Turks, Pagans, Unbelievers and their Children may be baptized, because they are a great part of the Nations. But Turks, Pagans and Unbelievers, and their Children, ought not to be baptized. *Ergo.*

Besides that, Teaching (by the Authority of the Commission) must go before Baptizing, we have proved; which generally all Learned Men do assert: if the Institution is to be found any where else, they must shew the Place.

Arg. 4. Faith and Repentance are required of all that ought to be baptized. Infants are not required to believe and repent, nor are they capable so to do. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

The *Major* is clear, *Acts* 2, 8, 10, 16 Chapters; and 'tis also asserted by the Church of *England*. What is required of Persons to be baptized? that's the Question. The Answer is, Repentance, whereby they forsake Sin; and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the Promise of God made to them in that Sacrament.

The *Minor* cannot be denied.

Arg. 5. That Practice that tends not to the Glory of God, nor to the Profit of the Child, when done, nor in after-times when grown up, but may prove hurtful and of a dangerous Nature to him, cannot be a Truth of God. But the Practice of Infant-Baptism tends not to the Glory of God, nor to the Profit of the Child when baptized, nor in after-times when grown up, but may prove hurtful and of a dangerous Nature to him. *Ergo.* See *Levit.* 10. 1, 2. where *Moses* told *Aaron*, because his Sons had done that which God commanded them not, that *God would be sanctified by all that drew near unto him*; intimating, that such who did that which God commanded not, did not sanctify or glorify God therein. Can God be glorified by Man's Disobedience, or by adding to his Word; by doing that which God hath not required? *Matth.* 16. 9. *In vain do you worship me, teaching for Doctrine the Commandments of Men?* and that that Practice

doth profit the Child, none can prove from God's Word: And in after-times when grown up, it may cauſe the Perſon to think he was thereby made a Chriſtian, *&c.* and brought into the Covenant of Grace, and had it ſealed to him, nay, thereby regenerated, for ſo theſe Gentlemen in their Mercury, *Decemb.* 26. plainly intimate, and that Infants are thereby ingrafted alſo into Chriſt's Church. Sure all underſtanding Men know Baptiſm of Believers is not called Regeneration, but only metonymically, it being a Figure of Regeneration. But they ignorantly affirm alſo, that Infants *then* have a federal Holineſs; as if this imagined Holineſs comes in by the Child's Covenant in Baptiſm, which may prove hurtful and dangerous to them, and cauſe them to think Baptiſm confers Grace, which is a great Error. 'How can Water, 'ſaith Mr. *Chauncy*, an external thing, work 'upon the Soul phyſically? Nor can it, ſaith 'he, be proved, that ever the Spirit of God 'is tied by any Promiſe, to apply himſelf to 'the Soul in a gracious Operation, when Wa'ter is applied to the Body: If it were ſo, 'then all that were baptized were regene'rated, then all that were baptized ſhould be 'ſaved, or elſe the Doctrine of Perſeverance 'falls to the Ground. Some indeed, ſays he, 'ſay, that Regeration is conferred in Bap'tiſm upon the Elect, and exerts it ſelf after'wards in Converſion. But how ſo active a 'Principle as a ſpiritual Life ſhould lie dead 'and aſleep ſo many Years, *&c.* is not eaſi'ly conceived. *On Regen.* p. 75.

Arg. 6. If the Church of *England* ſays, that Faith and Repentance are required of all that ought to be baptized, and in ſo ſaying, ſpeak truly, and yet Infants can't perform thoſe things; then Infants ought not to be baptized. But the Church of *England* ſays, that Faith and Repentance are required of all ſuch, *&c.* and ſpeak truly, and yet Infants cannot perform theſe things. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

Object. If it be objected, *That they affirm they do perform it by their Sureties.*

Anſw. If Sureti ſhip for Children in Baptiſm is not required of God, and the Sureties do not, cannot perform thoſe things for the Child: then Sureti ſhip is not of God, and ſo ſignifies nothing, but is an unlawful and ſinful Undertaking. But Sureti ſhip in Children Baptiſm is not required of God, and they do not, cannot perform what they promiſe. *Ergo.*

Do they, or can they cauſe the Child *to forſake the Devil and all his Works, the Pomps and Vanities of this wicked World, and all the ſinful Luſts of the Fleſh?* In a Word; Can they make the Child or Children to repent and truly believe in Jeſus Chriſt? for theſe are the things they promiſe for them, and in their Name. Alas, they want Power to do it for themſelves, and how then ſhould they do it for others? Beſides, we ſee they never mind nor regard their Covenant in the Caſe: and will not God one Day ſay, Who has required theſe things at your Hands?

Arg. 7. If there be no Precedent in the Scripture, (as there is no Precept) that any Infant was baptized, then Infants ought not to be baptized. But there is no Precedent that any Infant was baptized in the Scripture. *Ergo.*

If there is any Precedent or Example in Scripture that any Infant was baptized, let them ſhew us where we may find it.

Erasmus ſaith, 'Tis no where expreſſed in 'the Apoſtolical Writings, that they bapti'zed Children. *Union of the Church*, and on *Rom.* 6.

Calvin ſaith, 'It is no where expreſſed by 'the Evangeliſts, that any one Infant was 'baptized by the Apoſtles. *Inſtit.* c. 16. 'Book 4.

'*Ludovicus Vives* ſaith, 'None of old were 'wont to be baptized but in grown Age, and 'who deſired and underſtood what it was. *Vide Ludov.*

The *Magdeburgenſes* ſay, 'That concerning 'the baptizing the Adult, both Jews and 'Gentiles, we have ſufficient Proof from 'Acts 2, 8, 10, 16 Chapters; but as to the 'baptizing of Infants, they can meet with 'no Example in Scripture. *Magdeb. Cent. l.* 2. *p.* 469.

Dr. *Taylor* ſaith, 'It is againſt the perpe'tual Analogy of Chriſt's Doctrine to baptize 'Infants: For beſides that Chriſt never gave 'any Precept to baptize them, nor ever him'ſelf

'ſelf nor his Apoſtles (that appears) did 'baptize any of them: All that either he 'or his Apoſtles ſaid concerning it, requires 'ſuch previous Diſpoſitions of Baptiſm, of 'which Infants are not capable, *viz.* Faith 'and Repentance. *Lib. Proph. p.* 239.

Arg. 8. If whatſoever which is neceſſary to Faith and Practice is left in the Holy Scripture, that being a compleat and perfect Rule, and yet Infant-Baptiſm is not contained or to be found therein, then Infant-Baptiſm is not of God. But whatever is neceſſary to Faith and Practice, is contained in the Holy Scriptures, *&c.* but Infant-Baptiſm is not to be found therein. *Ergo.*

That the Scripture is a perfect Rule, *&c.* we have the Conſent of all the Ancient Fathers and Modern Divines.

Athanaſius ſaith, 'The Holy Scriptures be-'ing Inſpirations of God, are ſufficient to all 'Inſtructions of Truth. *Athan. againſt the Gentiles.*

Chryſoſtom ſaith, 'All things be plain and 'clear in the Scripture; and whatſoever are 'needful, are manifeſt there. *Chryſoſt.* on 2 *Theſſ.* and 2 *Tim.* 2.

Baſil ſaith, 'That it would be an Argu-'ment of Infidelity, and a moſt certain Sign 'of Pride, if any Man ſhould reject any thing 'written, and ſhould introduce things not 'written. *Baſil* in his Sermon *de Fide.*

Auguſtine ſaith, 'In the Scriptures are 'found all things which contain Faith, manner 'of Living, Hope, Love, *&c.* Let us, *ſaith 'he*, ſeek no farther than what is written of 'God our Saviour, leſt a Man would know 'more than the Scriptures witneſs. *Aug.* in his 178 Epiſtles to *Fortunat.*

Theophilact ſaith, 'It is part of a Diabolical 'Spirit, to think any thing Divine, without 'the Authority of the Holy Scripture. *Lib.* 2. *Paſchal.*

Iſychius ſaith, 'Let us who will have any 'thing obſerved of God, ſearch no more but 'that which the Goſpel doth give unto us. *Lib.* 5. *c.* 16. on *Levit.*

Bellarmin ſaith, 'That though the Argu-'ments of the Anabaptiſts, from the defect 'of Command or Example, have a great Uſe 'againſt the Lutherans, foraſmuch as they 'uſe that Rite every where, having no Com-'mand or Example, theirs is to be rejected; 'yet is it of no Force againſt Catholicks, who 'conclude the Apoſtolical Tradition is of no 'leſs Authority with us than the Scripture, '*&c.* this of baptizing of Infants is an Apo-'ſtolical Tradition. *Bellarm.* in his Book *de Bapt.* l. 1. *c.* 8.

Mr. *Ball* ſaith, 'We muſt for every Ordi-'nance look to the Inſtitution, and never 'ſtreteh it wider, nor draw it narrower than 'the Lord hath made it, for he is the Inſti-'tutor of the Sacraments according to his 'own Pleaſure; and 'tis our part to learn of 'him, both to whom, how, and for what 'End the Sacraments are to be adminiſtred. *Ball, in his Anſwer to the* New-England *Elders*, p. 38, 39.

And as to the *Minor*, 'tis acknowledged by our Adverſaries, it is not to be found in the Letter of the Scripture. And as to the Conſequences drawn therefrom, we have proved, they are not natural from the Premiſes; and though we admit of Conſequences and Inferences if genuine, yet not in the caſe of an Inſtitution reſpecting a practical Ordinance that is of meer poſitive Right.

Arg. 9. If Infant-Baptiſm was an Inſtitution of Chriſt, the Pedo-Baptiſts could not be at a loſs about the Grounds of the Right Infants have to Baptiſm: But the Pedo-Baptiſts are at a great Loſs, and differ exceedingly about the Grounds of the Right Infants have to Baptiſm. *Ergo*, 'tis no Inſtitution of Chriſt.

As touching the *Major*, I argue thus; That which is an Inſtitution of Chriſt, the Holy Scripture doth ſhew, as well the End and Ground of the Ordinance, as the Subject and Manner of it. But the Scripture ſpeaks nothing of the End or Ground of Pedo-Baptiſm, or for what reaſon they ought to be baptized. *Ergo*, 'tis no Inſtitution of Chriſt.

The *Minor* is undeniable; Some affirm, as we have ſhewed, *p.* 15. it was to take away Original Sin. Some ſay it is their Right by the Covenant, they being the Seed of Believers. Others ſay, Infants have Faith, and therefore have a Right. Others ſay, They

have a Right by the Faith of their Sureties. Some ground their Right from an Apoſtolical Tradition; others upon the Authority of Scripture. Some ſay, All Children of profeſſed Chriſtians ought to be baptized; others ſay, None but the Children of true Believers have a Right to it. Sure, if it was an Ordinance of Chriſt, his Word would ſoon end this Controverſy.

Arg. 10. If the Children of believing Gentiles, as ſuch, are not the natural nor ſpiritual Seed of *Abraham*, they can have no Right to Baptiſm, or Church-Membership, by virtue of any Covenant-tranſaction God made with *Abraham*. But the Children of believing Gentiles, as ſuch, are not the natural nor ſpiritual Seed of *Abraham*. *Ergo*.

Arg. 11. If no Man can prove from Scripture, that any ſpiritual Benefit redounds to Infants in their Baptiſm, 'tis no Ordinance of Chriſt. But no Man can prove from Scripture, that any ſpiritual Benefit redounds to Infants in their Baptiſm. *Ergo*.

Arg. 12. That cannot be an Ordinance of Chriſt, for which there is neither Command nor Example in all God's Word, nor Promiſe to ſuch who do it, nor Threatnings to ſuch who neglect it. But there is no Command or Example in all the Word of God for the baptizing of little Babes, nor Promiſe made to ſuch who are baptized, nor Threatnings to ſuch who are not. *Ergo*.

That the Child lies under a Promiſe who is baptized, or the Child under any Threatning or Danger that is not baptized, let them prove it, ſince it is denied.

Arg. 13. If no Parents, at any time or times, have been by God the Father, Jeſus Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, either commended for baptizing of their Children, or reproved for neglecting to baptize them; then Infant-Baptiſm is no Ordinance of God. But no Parents at any time or times have been by God commended for baptizing of their Children, *&c.* *Ergo*, Infant-Baptiſm is no Ordinance of God.

This Argument will ſtand unanſwerable, unleſs any can ſhew who they were that were ever commended for baptizing their Children, or reproved for neglecting it, or unleſs they can ſhew a parallel caſe.

Arg. 14. If Men were not to preſume to alter any thing in the Worſhip of God under the Law, neither to add thereto, nor diminiſh therefrom, and God is as ſtrict and jealous of his Worſhip under the Goſpel; then nothing ought to be altered in God's Worſhip under the Goſpel. But under the Law Men were not to preſume ſo to do, and God is as ſtrict and jealous under the Goſpel. *Ergo*.

The *Major* cannot be denied.

The *Minor* is clear; *See thou make all things according to the Pattern ſhewed thee in the Mount*, *Exod.* 25. 40. and *Levit.* 10. 1, 2. See how *Nadab* and *Abihu* ſped, for preſuming to vary from the Command of God, and *Uzzah*, tho but in ſmall Circumſtances as they may ſeem to us. How dare Men adventure, this being ſo, to change Baptiſm from Dipping into Sprinkling, and the Subject, from an Adult Believer, to an ignorant Babe? *Add thou not unto his Word*, &c.

Arg. 15. Whatever Practice opens a Door to any humane Traditions and Innovations in God's Worſhip, is a great Evil, and to be avoided: But the Practice of Infant-Baptiſm opens a Door to any humane Traditions and Innovations in God's Worſhip. *Ergo*, to ſprinkle or baptize Infants is a great Evil, and to be avoided.

The *Major* will not be denied.

The *Minor* is clear, becauſe there is no Scripture-ground for it, no Command nor Example for ſuch a Practice in God's Word. And if without Scripture-Authority the Church hath Power to do one thing, ſhe may do another, and ſo *ad infinitum*.

Arg. 16. Whatſoever Practice reflects upon the Honour, Wiſdom and Care of Jeſus Chriſt, or renders him leſs faithful than *Moſes*, and the New Teſtament in one of its great Ordinances, (nay, Sacraments) to lie more obſcure in God's Word, than any Law or Precept under the Old Teſtament, cannot be of God. But the Practice of Infant-Baptiſm reflects on the Honour, Care and Faithfulneſs of Jeſus Chriſt, and renders him leſs faithful than *Moſes*, and a great Ordinance, (nay, Sacrament) of the New Teſtament, to lie more dark and obſcure than any Precept under the Old Teſtament. *Ergo*, Infant-Baptiſm cannot be of God.

The

The *Major* cannot be denied.

The *Minor* is eaſily proved: For he is bold indeed who ſhall affirm Infant-Baptiſm doth not lie obſcure in God's Word. One great Party who aſſert it, ſay, 'tis not to be found in the Scripture at all, but 'tis an unwritten Apoſtolical Tradition: others ſay, it lies not in the Letter of the Scripture, but may be proved by Conſequences; and yet ſome great Aſſerters of it, as Dr. *Hammond* and others, ſay, Thoſe Conſequences commonly drawn from divers Texts for it, are without Demonſtration, and ſo prove nothing. I am ſure a Man may read the Scripture a hundred times over, and never be thereby convinced; he ought to baptize his Children, tho it is powerful to convince Men of all other Duties.

Now can this be a Truth, ſince Chriſt who was more faithful than *Moſes*, and delivered every thing plainly from the Father? *Moſes* left nothing dark as to matter of Duty, tho the Precepts and external Rites of his Law were numerous, two or three hundred Precepts, yet none were at a loſs, or had need to ſay, Is this a Truth or an Ordinance, or not? for he that runs may read it.

And ſhall one poſitive Precept given forth by Chriſt, who appointed ſo few in the New Teſtament, be ſo obſcure, as alſo the ground and end of it, that Men ſhould be confounded about the Proofs of it, together with the end and ground thereof? See *Heb.* 3. 5, 6.

Arg. 17. That Cuſtom or Law which *Moſes* never delivered to the Jews, nor is any where written in the Old Teſtament, was no Truth of God, nor of Divine Authority. But that Cuſtom or Law to baptize Proſelytes either Men, Women or Children, was never given to the Jews by *Moſes*, nor is it any where written in the Old Teſtament. *Ergo*, It was no Truth of God, nor of Divine Authority: And evident it is, as Sir *Norton Knatchbul* ſhews, 'That the *Jewiſh Rabbins* differed among themſelves alſo about 'it: for, ſaith he, *Rabbi Eliezer* expreſly 'contradicts *Rabbi Joſhua*, who was the firſt 'I know of who aſſerted this ſort of Baptiſm among the Jews. For *Eliezer*, who 'was contemporary with *Rabbi Joſhua*, if he 'did not live before him, aſſerts, that a 'Proſelyte circumciſed and not baptized, 'was a true Proſelyte.

Arg. 18. If Baptiſm is of mere poſitive Right, wholly depending on the Will and Sovereign Pleaſure of Jeſus Chriſt, the great Legiſlator: And he hath not required or commanded Infants to be baptized: then Infants ought not to be baptized: But Baptiſm is of mere poſitive Right, wholly depending on the Will and ſovereign Pleaſure of Jeſus Chriſt, the great Legiſlator, and he hath not required or commanded Infants to be baptized. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

This Argument tends to cut off all the pretended Proofs of Pedo-Baptiſm, taken from the Covenant made with *Abraham*; and becauſe Children are ſaid to belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, it was not the Right of *Abraham*'s Male Children to be circumciſed, becauſe they were begotten, and born of the Fruit of his Loins, till he received Commandment from God to circumciſe them. Had he done it before, or without a Command from God, it would have been Will-Worſhip in him ſo to have done. Moreover, this further appears to be ſo, Becauſe no godly Man's Children, nor others in *Abraham*'s Days, nor ſince, had any Right thereto, but only his Children, (or ſuch who were bought with his Money, or were proſelyted to the Jewiſh Religion) becauſe they had no Command from God ſo to do, as *Abraham* had. This being true, it follows, that if we ſhould grant Infants of believing Gentiles, as ſuch, were the Seed of *Abraham* (which we deny) yet unleſs God had commanded them to baptize their Children, they ought not to do it; and if they do it without a Command or Authority from Chriſt, it will be found an Act of Will-Worſhip in them.

Arg. 19. All that were baptized in the Apoſtolical Primitive Times, were baptized upon the Profeſſion of Faith, were baptized into Chriſt, and thereby put on Chriſt, and were all one in Chriſt Jeſus, and were *Abraham*'s Seed and Heirs, according to Promiſe. But Infants, as ſuch, who are baptized, were not baptized upon the Profeſſion of their Faith, nor did they put on Chriſt thereby,

Nor are they all one in Christ Jesus, also are not *Abraham's* Seed and Heirs according to Promise. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

Mr. *Baxter* confirms the Substance of the *Major*. These are his very Words, *i. e. As many as have been baptized have put on Christ, and are all one in Christ Jesus; and are Abraham's Seed, and Heirs, according to the Promise*, Gal. 3. 27, 28, 29. 'This speaks the Apostle, saith 'he, of the Probability grounded on a credi-'ble Profession, *&c. Baxter's Confirm. Reconcil.* pag. 32.

The *Minor* will stand firm till any can prove Infants by a visible Profession have put on Christ, are all one in Christ Jesus, are *Abraham's* Seed and Heirs according to Promise. Evident it is, none are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, but such who have the Faith of *Abraham*, and are truly grafted into Christ, by a Saving-Faith. If any object, We read of some who were baptized, who had no Saving-Faith, but were Hypocrites. I answer; Had they appeared to be such, they had not been baptized, not had they a true Right thereto.

Arg. 20. Baptism is the solemnizing of the Souls Marriage-Union with Christ, which Marriage-Contract absolutely requires an actual Profession of consent. Infants are not capable to enter into a Marriage-Union with Christ, not to make a Profession of Consent. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

The *Major* our Opposits generally grant, particularly see what Mr. *Baxter* saith, 'Our 'Baptism is the solemnizing of our Marri-'age with Christ. These are his Words, p. 32.

The *Minor* none can deny: No Man sure in his right Mind, will assert that little Babes are capable to enter into a Marriage-Relation with Christ, and to make a Profession of a Consent: And the Truth is, he in the next Words gives away his Cause, *viz.* 'And 'tis, 'saith he, a new and strange kind of Marri-'age, where there is no Profession of Con-'sent; p. 32. How unhappy was this Man to plead for such a new and strange kind of Marriage: Did he find any little Babe he ever baptized (or rather rantized) to make a Professioo of Consent to be married to Jesus Christ. If any should object, he speaks of the Baptism of the Adult. I answer, his Words are these, 'Our Beptism is, *&c.* Besides, will any Pedo-Baptist say, that the Baptism of the Adult is the solemnizing of the Souls Marriage with Christ, and not the Baptism of Infants. Reader, observe how our Opposits are forced sometimes to speak the Truth, though it overthrows their own Practice of Pedo-Baptism.

Arg. 21. If the Sins of no Persons are forgiven them till they are converted, then they must not be baptized for the Forgiveness of them, till they profess themselves to be converted; but the Sins of no Persons are forgiven them till they are converted. *Ergo*, No Person ought to be baptized for the Forgiveness of them, till they profess they are converted.

Mr. *Baxter* in the said Treatise lays down the Substance of this Argument also, take his own Words, *i. e.* 'As their Sins are not 'forgiven them till they are converted, *Mark* '4. 12. so they must not be baptized for the 'Forgiveness of them, till they profess them-'selves converted, seeing to the Church, *non* '*esse*, and *non apparere* is all one. Repentance 'towards God, and Faith towards our Lord 'Jesus is the Sum of that Preaching that 'makes Disciples, *Acts* 20. 21. Therefore, 'saith he, both these must by a Profession 'seem to be received, before any at Age are 'baptized; p. 30. 31. And evident it is, say I, from hence none but such at Age ought to be baptized. '*Philip* caused the Eunuch to 'profess before he would baptize him, that '*he believed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* '*Saul* had also, saith he, more than a bare 'Profession before Baptism, *Acts* 9. 5, 15, '17. p. 28. The Promise it self, saith he 'doth expresly require a Faith of our own, of 'all the Adult that will have part in the Pri-'viledges: therefore there is a Faith of our 'own, that is the Condition of our Title; '*Mark* 16. 16. p. 16.

He might have added by the Force of his Argument; therefore Infants should not have the Priviledges: for I argue thus, *viz.*

Arg. 22. If there is but one Baptism of Water left by Jesus Christ in the New Testament,

ment, and but one Condition or Manner of Right thereto: and that one Baptism is that of the Adult; then Infant-Baptism is no Baptism of Christ. But there is but one Baptism in Water left by Christ in the New Testament, and but one Condition and Manner of Right thereto, and that one Baptism is that of the Adult. *Ergo*, Infant-Baptism is no Baptism of Christ.

Mr. *Baxter* saith, Faith and Repentance is the Condition of the Adult, and as to any other Condition, I am sure the Scripture is silent; the Way of the Lord is one, *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*, Ephes. 4. 4.

'If Profession of Faith were not necessary, 'saith Mr. *Baxter*, *eyam Ecclesiâ*, to Church-'Membership and Priviledges, then Infidels 'and Heathens would have Right; also, saith 'he, the Church and the World would be 'confounded. He might have added, but Infidels and Heathens have no Right to Church-Membership, *&c. Ergo*, 'Tis a grant-'ed Case among all Christians, saith he, that 'Profession is thus necessary, the Apostles 'and Ancient Church admitted none without it; pag. 21. And if so, why dare any now adays admit of Infants, who are capable to make no Profession. He adds, 'Yea 'Christ in his Commission directeth his Apo-'stles to make Disciples, and then baptize 'them, promising, *He that believeth, and is 'baptized, shall be saved*, Mark 16. 16. pag. 27. Furthermore he saith, '*If as many as we bap-'tized into Christ, we baptized into his Death, 'and are buried with him by Baptism into Death; 'that like as Christ was raised from the Dead, so we also should walk in Newness of Life*, &c. 'Then no doubt, saith he, but such as were 'to be baptized, did first profess this Morti-'fication, and a Consent to be buried, *&c.* 'In our Baptism we put off the Body of the 'the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision 'of Christ, *being buried with him, and raised 'with him through Faith, quickned with him, and 'having all our Trespasses forgiven*, Col. 2. 11, 12, 13. And will any Man (says he) yea, will *Paul* ascribe all this to those that did not 'so much as profess the things signified? Will 'Baptism, in the Judgment of a wise Man, do 'all this for an Infidel, (or, say I, for an Infant) 'that cannot make a Profession that he is a 'Christian? pag. 31, 32. He proceeds.

Arg. 23. The Baptized are in Scripture called Men washed, sanctified, justified; they are called Saints, and Churches of Saints, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. all Christians are sanctified ones: pag. 33. Now let me add the *Minor*.

But Infants baptized are not in Scripture called Men washed, sanctified, justified, they are not called Saints, Churches of Saints, Christians, nor sanctified ones. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized. If any should say, Why did you not cite these Assertions of Mr. *Baxter*'s whilst he was living? I answer, More then twelve Years ago I did recite and print these Assertions, and many other Arguments of his to the same Purpose, to which he gave no Answer.

Arg. 24. If there is but one way for all, both Parents and Children to be admitted into the Gospel-Church to the End of the World, and that it is upon the Profession of Faith to be baptized; then both Parents and Children must upon the Profession of their Faith be baptized, and so admitted, *&c.* But there is but one way for all, both Parents and Children, to be admitted into the Gospel-Church to the End of the World, and that is upon the Profession of their Faith to be baptized. *Ergo*.

Arg. 25. That cannot be Christ's true Baptism wherein there is not, cannot be a lively Representation of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, together with our Death unto Sin, and Vivification to a new Life. But in the Ramming or Sprinkling of an Infant, there is not, cannot be a lively Representation of Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection, *&c.* *Ergo*.

Arg. 26. That pretended Baptism that tends to frustrate the glorious End and Design of Christ in his instituting of Gospel-Baptism, we cannot answer it, it is none of Christ's Baptism. But the pretended Baptism of Infants tends to frustrate the glorious end and design of Christ in instituting of Gospel-Baptism. *Ergo*.

The *Major* will not be denied.

As to the *Minor*, all generally confess the End or Design of Christ in instituting the Ordinance of Baptism, was in a lively Figure, to represent his Death, Burial, and Resurrection, with the Person's Death unto

Sin,

Sin and his rising again to walk in newness of Life) that is baptized, as the Sacrament of the Supper was ordained to represent his Body was broke, and his Blood was shed: But that a lively Figure of Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, appears in sprinkling a little Water on the Face, I see not; and as done to an Infant, there can no Death to Sin, and rising again to walk in newness of Life, be signified; And therefore Christ's Design and End therein is frustrated.

Ans. 27. If Baptism be Immersion, as to the proper and genuine signification of the word *Baptizo*, as also of those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms and the spiritual Signification thereof; then Sprinkling cannot be Christ's true Baptism. But Immersion is the proper and genuine signification of the word *Baptizo*, and also of those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms spoken of, and the spiritual Signification thereof. *Ergo*, Sprinkling is not Christ's true Baptism.

1. That the proper and genuine Signification of the word *Baptizo* is Immersion, or to dip, &c. we have proved, which is also confessed by the Learned in that Language.

2. The Figurative Baptism was, 1st. That of the Red Sea, wherein the Fathers were buried, as it were, unto *Moses* in the Sea, and under the Cloud. *Poole Annotations on* 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. 'Others, *saith he*, more probably 'think that the Apostle useth this term, in 'regard of the great Analogy betwixt *Baptism* '(as it was then used) the Persons going 'down into the Waters, and being dipped in 'them; and the Israelites going down into 'the Sea, the great Receptacle of Water, 'though the Water at that time was gather-'ed on Heaps on either side of them; yet 'they seemed buried in the Water, as Per-'sons in that Age were when they were bap-'tized, &c. The 2d. was that of *Noah's* Ark. See Sir *Isaac Newton Knatchbull*: 'The Ark 'of *Noah* and *Baptism*, *saith he*, were both a 'Type and Figure of the Resurrection, not the 'Sign of the washing away of Sin, though so 'taken metonymically, but a particular Sig-'nal of the Resurrection of Christ: So this 'Baptism is a lively and emphatical Figure, as 'also was the Ark of *Noah*, out of which he 'returned as from a Sepulchre, to a new Life.

3. Metaphorical Baptism is that of the Spirit and of Affliction: the first signifies not a sprinkling of the Spirit, but the great Effusion of the Spirit, like that at *Pentecost*, Acts 1. 4, 5. *Shall be baptized*, &c. on which Words *Casaubon* speaks thus: See Dr. *Dav. Veil* on *Acts* 2. 'The Greek Word βαπτίζω 'is to *dip* or *plunge*, as it were to die Co-'lours, in which Sense, *saith he*, the Apostles 'might be truly said to have been baptized 'for the House in which this was done, was 'filled with the Holy Ghost; so that the A-'postles might seem to have been plunged in-'to it as in a large Fish-Pond. Also *Oecumenius* on *Acts* 2. saith, 'A Wind filled the 'whole House, that it seemed like a Fish-'Pond, because it was promised to the Apo-'stles, that they should be baptized with the 'Holy Ghost. And the Baptism of Affliction are those great depths or overwhelmings of Afflictions, like that of our Saviour's suffering, i. e. no part free; *Matth.* 20. 22. where you have the same Greek Word βαπτίζω; and like that of *David*, who saith, *God drew him out of great Waters*.

4. The spiritual Signification thereof is the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, and of our Death to Sin, and Vivification to a new Life.

This being so, it follows undeniably Sprinkling cannot be Christ's true Baptism, it must be Immersion, and nothing else.

And in the last Place, *Finally*, To confirm that *Baptizo* is to *dip*, both from the literal and spiritual Signification thereof, as also from those typical and metaphorical Baptisms mentioned in the Scripture, I might add further, that this evidently appears from the Practice of *John Baptist* and the Apostles of Christ, who baptized in *Rivers*, and *where there was much Water*: and also, because the Baptizer and Baptized are said to go down *into* the Water, (not down *to* the Water) and came up out of the Water. *John Baptist* is said to baptize them *into Jordan*, as the Greek Word renders it, which shews it *dipping* and not *sprinkling*. Would it be proper to say, *He sprinkled them into Jordan?* The Lord open the Eyes of those who see not, to consider these things.

FINIS.